The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 1, 1920 No. 2861

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 569

EDITORIALS:

- Where the American People Stand 572
- Mr. Chamberlain's Budget 573
- Caillaux 574
- What British Workers Want 575

THE CASE AGAINST THE INJUNCTION. By George Soule 576

PARIS REMEMBERS THE COMMUNE. By Ida O'Neil 577

ITALIAN WORKERS AS THEIR OWN EMPLOYERS. By Hiram K. Moderwell 578

THE STEEL-MAKERS. By Henry Raymond Mussey 580

"CA'-CANNY" IN JAPAN. By Miles M. Sherower 582

THE LABOR CHURCH IN CANADA. By W. Irvine 583

PRELUDE TO A PANTOMIME. By Gustav Davidson 584

COMMUNISM IN THE RUHR. By William MacDonald 585

THE VICTORY OF GERMAN DEMOCRACY. By Theodor Wolff 586

WHY FREEDOM DISAPPEARS. By Will Durant 587

H. G. WELLS AND THE WAR. By Douglas Goldring 589

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 591

CORRESPONDENCE 591

BOOKS:

- Labor and Liberty. By Harold J. Laski 594
- Whose America? By Jacob Zeitlin 595
- According to Dreiser. By Van Wyck Brooks 595
- Drama in Russia. By J. 596
- Souls Trapped. By J. T. 597

DRAMA: Marionettes. By Ludwig Lewisohn 597

MUSIC: Fair Play. By Henrietta Straus 599

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 600

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ARTHUR WARNER, ASSOCIATE EDITORS, FREDA KIRCHWEY, ARTHUR GLEASON

CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

NO more shocking charge has ever been made against our Government than that formulated by Judge George W. Anderson of the United States District Court, when he declared that, after the testimony offered in his court, "it is perfectly evident to my mind that the Government owns and operates at least part of the Communist Party." When this charge was originally made by radicals no great attention was paid to it. But Judge Anderson asserts — without contradiction from Attorney-General Palmer as yet—that the American Government has sunk to the level of the Czar's and the Kaiser's in the use of *agents provocateurs*. The radicals charged that the *very portions* of the Communist platform upon which the Government based its prosecutions were written by men in the pay of the Government for the express purpose of trapping them. To this no reply was made. To Judge Anderson it appears that through its spies in the Communist Party meetings were called *by the Government itself* for January 2, the night upon which the raids took place. The Department of Justice thus stands charged as a creator of crime and as in part manufacturer of that alleged threat against our American Government upon which Mr. Palmer is largely basing his candidacy for the Presidency. One must go back to the Austrian misgovernment of Italy during the fifties to find a parallel for actions so amazing and so contemptible, and they are particularly base in a Government which asserts that it is free and democratic.

BUT Judge Anderson did not stop there. It was proved before him that a warrant for a man taken on January 2 was not issued until January 15, when it was telegraphed from Washington. The whole procedure of the Government, the Judge said, "seems to have been carried out on the theory of hang first and try afterwards." When Mr. Palmer's Boston representative tried to defend the action of the Government, the Judge replied:

> I wish you would show me one case in which the Department of Justice has the authority to arrest persons and hold them for two weeks without warrants. A more lawless proceeding is hard to conceive. Talk about Americanization; what we need is Americanization of those who carry on such proceedings. I can hardly sit on the bench as an American citizen and restrain my indignation. I view with horror such proceedings as this.

Judge Anderson next asked an agent of Mr. Palmer how he dared arrest a person without warrant. The reply was that he was acting under instructions from Washington. To this the Judge replied: "Any citizen with a knowledge of Americanism should resign when given such instructions." There at last is the note of real Americanism! Massachusetts has again brought forth a man to voice, under the shadow of Fanueil Hall, the old traditions, the old liberties, the most sacred of our American rights. That there is a Judge Anderson to brand the Department of Justice as it should be is enough to stir the pulses.

CALLOUS disregard of the public, of the underpaid railroad workers, of everything but their own jobs and pocket-books, characterizes the action of the railway managers and Brotherhood of Trainmen officials, recently taken in the name of "discipline." If these authorities had even tacitly admitted their own faults in the series of events which led up to the spontaneous walk-out, they would have welcomed the vacationists back to the union and the railroads, with full seniority and other rights. The breach might have been healed, especially if the roads had been willing to allow the national Railroad Board to make increases without obstruction and delay. To take such generous action, however, would have been to admit that the rank and file had at least some justification, and that was beyond the capacity of these gentlemen. Instead, the officials of the Brotherhood of Trainmen have attempted to safeguard their own jobs by expelling the most active of the disaffected locals, and the railroad managers have refused to accept the men back with seniority privileges, on the theory that this is the way to punish the "rebels" and get rid of the "agitators." If the strike had been caused by original sin, such action might have been effective. As it is, however, it will probably force the growth of a powerful rival union, prolong the walk-out and perhaps extend it, and, if the men are finally defeated, plant deep in the ranks of the workers the seeds of resentment against arbitrary rule.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE all remember the vague statements made by the employers about the number of steel strikers and the press statements, usually in terms of meaningless percentages, which nevertheless gave the impression that very few were actually out. Now comes Secretary-Treasurer W. Z. Foster's detailed and audited report. Of new union members in the steel industry, a part of whose initiation fees was actually forwarded to the national committee, there were 156,702, distributed among 41 towns and 23 unions. This does not include the thousands who signed up at Bethlehem, Steelton, and other important centers, or those who joined after early 1919 in Gary, Joliet, Indiana Harbor, and South Chicago, or the great number of ex-soldiers who were charged no initiation fee—1,300 of them in Johnstown alone—or the men recruited directly by the local unions, or the thousands who struck without actually joining the unions and paying their fees. Altogether, the committee's estimate of 250,000 strikers is a modest one. This effectively disposes of Mr. Gary's statement that he was resisting a minority of the workmen involved. Incidentally, it was while Mr. Foster was personally preparing this report, and the 24-page itemized account of receipts and disbursements from the $400,000 relief fund, and was writing a book about the strike, that he also, according to our Government, found time to arrange a nation-wide railroad strike. Such organizing genius would place Mr. Foster, in the estimation of a nation which worships efficiency, far above Judge Gary, Mr. Farrell, and Mr. Schwab.

TREASON stalks abroad in the land. Of that there can be no doubt after the returns from the Georgia primary. In a three-cornered race Thomas E. Watson polled 51,974 votes to Hoke Smith's 45,568 and Attorney General Palmer's 48,460. Now the amazing thing about this result is that Mr. Palmer appealed to every patriot to vote for him and so stand by the President, the League of Nations and our national honor, while Senator Hoke Smith stood for the League with reservations and on his own record in the Senate. As for Watson, he opposed the war from the beginning. According to Postmaster General Burleson, certain articles in Watson's newspaper constituted "in effect the advocacy of treason, insurrection, and forcible resistance," and Mr. Watson's publication was therefore excluded from the mails. It was also charged that he attempted to convince soldiers that they were the victims of lawless and unconstitutional oppression when they were drafted. Yet this man heads the poll, although in his point of view and in his opposition to the President he is the exact antithesis of Mr. Palmer. Senator Smith's case shows what a poor policy it is to trim; it has been said of him that he has always opposed the President's policies until the time came to vote. Coming after the sweep in Wisconsin, by La Follette, who also opposed the war, it begins to look as if after all the American people have begun to take second thought as to that undertaking. The four La Follette delegates-at-large carried Wisconsin by about 50,000, and if it had not been for an interloper who attached La Follette's name to his designation on the ballot, their majority would have been nearly 100,000.

AS for the Nebraska primary, Johnson swept the State easily, defeating two generals, Wood and Pershing, and, despite the early reports to the contrary, Bryan handily won a place as a delegate to the San Francisco convention. Like the Georgia vote, this Bryan success does not spell popularity for the Wilson Administration, which is, however, taking keen satisfaction out of the fact that Senator Hitchcock was also upheld and that the Missouri Democratic convention turned down Senator Reed and commended Mr. Wilson. Senator Johnson has had a walk-over in Montana and General Wood will run by himself in Vermont. Ohio is, therefore, the next test of importance and there the contest lies between Wood and Harding. If the General is badly defeated there, he will be near the end of his candidacy. The Republican standpatters cannot look with satisfaction upon the remarkable rise in Johnson's stock, but it still remains doubtful whether any candidate now in sight will win the prize at Chicago. On the Democratic side, Mr. McAdoo's chances improve steadily because of Mr. Palmer's extremely poor showing both in Michigan and Georgia.

SAN REMO was anything but epoch making; yet the conference there has had results. For the moment there is agreement between England and France as to the policy toward Germany, which, at this writing, has not been definitely announced save that Germany is to be given a fixed indemnity, variously stated at 22 billions and 90 billions. There is to be some disarmament and the threat of severe measures if the treaty is not lived up to. Before this agreement Mr. Lloyd George made public an excellent statement on the desirability of not starving Germany to death. The Allies have again recognized Armenia as an independent republic, our State Department following suit last week, and a settlement of the Fiume situation seems to have been reached along the lines suggested by Mr. Wilson, upon which the President is to be congratulated—if it goes through finally and if d'Annunzio gives his consent. At least, this will reinforce the position of those who have been saying that if the President had stuck to all his guns in Paris, he could have led the way in other matters. Finally, the mandate for Armenia is still being hawked about and dangled before America—we are urged to finance the new republic, too—while Syria goes to France, and Mesopotamia and Palestine to England. The spoils of the war are being distributed.

THE littlest man at San Remo appears the biggest. It is the five-foot Nitti who emerges best from the conference. At last there is a statesman who talks sense and speaks in the spirit of humanity. Like a veritable *enfant terrible* he told the truth thus about the new Turkish treaty which San Remo determined:

> You will have war in Asia Minor, and Italy will not send a single soldier nor pay a single lira. You have taken from the Turks their sacred city of Adrianople. You have placed their capital city under foreign control; you have taken from them every port and the larger part of their territory, and the five Turkish delegates whom you will select will sign a treaty which will not have the sanction of the Turkish people or the Turkish Parliament.

How far we have come from Versailles when a Prime Minister dares to talk thus! But more important than that is his statement under the noses of Lloyd George and Millerand that "peace must be brought to all Europe and Europe given back to work. We must make peace at once and everywhere, or we are fated to the direst catastrophes. There is only one means to attain this result. Conquered and conquerors must be made one." That is sound sense as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well as sound humanity; it points the only way to salvation for Europe. Forced to it perhaps by the Socialist and labor uprising in Northern Italy, Nitti declares that Austria must be aided and not ruined. He is also demanding official recognition of Soviet Russia and threatens to accord it himself if the Allies do not move at once.

LABOR in Russia, according to Secretary of Commerce Redfield, has been forced into a "state of serfdom and oppression the like of which has not been known for a century." His charge is based upon a reading—a hasty reading, we are led to believe—of the Code of Labor Laws of Soviet Russia, a summary of which we publish in another column. On this particular May 1 it is interesting to consider that code in the light of Mr. Redfield's opinion. Under its provisions all able-bodied men and women in Russia must labor; there is no leisure class either at the bottom or the top. There are doubtless those in this country at both ends of the social scale who would consider such a law "serfdom and oppression." But in Russia every man and woman not only must labor but may labor. The duty to work involves a right to work, and when no work is available the state is called upon to pay the worker, not an unemployment dole, but the full wage paid in his accustomed trade. If work is available in a trade which pays less, the worker is still remunerated according to the scale of his own chosen trade. Other provisions are included in the code, some for the protection of the worker, some for the protection of industry—but none for the protection of private capital. We wonder if "every American workman" would, as Mr. Redfield asserts, resent as tyranny a code which, limiting his right to quit work, insured his right to a job and a steady wage, and recognized the dominant power of his union?

"MR. HODGSON said that when the opportunity came they were going to lead the working class to seize power, and that if there was any opposition they were going to fight. He thought the best and easiest way to avoid excessive bloodshed was to make it clear now that they were going to fight for power. What they were setting out to do could never be done except by force of arms. . . . The working classes must arm themselves for the great day when they must rout the capitalist class by force." Such were the sentiments freely uttered and faithfully reported at the recent convention of the British Socialist Party held at the Bethnal-green Town Hall under the presidency of the Mayor of Bethnal-green. The convention was allowed by the authorities to proceed with its business. It is unlikely that the British Government or a majority of the British people would subscribe to a doctrine of violent revolution. Why, then, was a blatant, public advocacy of unlawful and bloody methods of class warfare noted but allowed to go unreproved? This is a question to which the press of the United States will doubtless never find an answer. And yet the British government is likely to remain in power at least as long as the little autocrats at Albany and Washington.

A HIGH school student from Clinton, Iowa, has won first prize in the War Department's prize essay contest. Chillicothe, Missouri, takes second prize, and Olive Branch, Mississippi, third, on the benefits of an enlistment in the army. This is an ingenious method of inspiring proper politics and patriotism in the younger generation of Clinton, Chillicothe, and Olive Branch. In some schools of the West, and perhaps of the East and South, too, this prize essay writing was made compulsory for high-school students. (A few pusillanimous school boards, awed by the protests of labor councils, let the contest be purely voluntary.) Of course the contest is no debate—the students are to argue the side that will win the prize; and the prize-winners, in addition to their gold and silver and bronze medals, get a free trip to Washington at the taxpayers' expense. It must be said that the War Department has been rather amateurish in applying the method. It might have had the nation's school children argue the benefits of universal military training or of compulsory military service. Then Mitchell Palmer might start a national school essay contest on The Menace of Free Speech and the Superiority of Suppression, with Albert Sidney Burleson, Thaddeus Sweet, and Ole Hanson as judges; Josephus Daniels might start another on America's Need for Incomparably the Greatest Navy in the World; in fact, the method, carried to its logical conclusion, might include a compulsory prize essay contest on The Necessity for a Third Term. Why not?

THE pure patrolman who raised a row over "The Story of a Lover" that brought the publishers into court has not been sustained by the magistrate before whom the case came. "Jurgen," however, is still under the ban awaiting trial. We might think of this as meaning that the erotic symbolism of the latter is considered more dangerous than the amorous autobiography of the former, if we were not sure that here, as elsewhere, our laws simply do not call for any such nice distinctions. Who, indeed, would do the distinguishing? The publishers of "The Story of a Lover" ask in vain for the appointment of some committee competent to pass upon books that are more candid than the ordinary run. As matters now stand, the lowest grade of intelligence can bring annoying and perhaps damaging charges against a book without any responsibility if the charge fails to hold. This is the most indecent aspect of the whole situation. If only such fellows, while the law remains in force, would take note of the unabashed exposure of ignorance and inhumanity committed every day by the Administration and the newspapers of the country!

A RATHER disconcerting question has been asked recently of the American Library Association: how many persons in the United States have no access to free public libraries? The United States Bureau of Education answers as follows: In 30 States less than fifty per cent of the population has access to such libraries, in six States less than ten per cent, and in one State less than two per cent. The income of public libraries is, according to conservative estimates, one-sixth of the amount necessary to adequate service. Only twenty-seven per cent of the counties in this country have within their territory a library of five thousand volumes. Rather upsetting evidence for those who have boasted of the public library as a typically democratic, American institution! Rather surprising to find that the library system, all carefully housed in attractive buildings, provided with card indexes and catalogues and neat young women librarians, has not extended its service nearly as widely as those living in or near large cities may have supposed! The reason for this is to be found partly in the scanty financial backing allotted to public libraries. It is to remedy this state of affairs that the American Library Association has pledged itself to raise two million dollars.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where the American People Stand

THE American people are not at all inclined to take it ill of any one who tells them that they are, after all, novices in the field of international relations. They know very well that they have never had the close contact with European or Asiatic peoples which most other nations have had; and that, in consequence, there are a great many matters of language, race, religion, political history, and social preference of which they are comparatively ignorant. Then, too, they have never really feared foreign invasion, notwithstanding all that jingoes and alarmists have told them; and they have never taken seriously the talk about political or trade combinations against them that were to be hatched in other countries. It is not of the American nature to fear any one, or to lose sleep over every war cloud that appears on the horizon. That is why Americans have never really cared for a big army or a big navy. When the nation was threatened with disunion, in 1861, there was no difficulty in raising troops enough to put down secession and hold the country together. There is a popular impression that then and in 1917-18 the American soldiers did what was expected of them, and that there is no need of keeping up a huge establishment merely because there may some time be another similar calamity. Moreover, if the truth must be told, most Americans have probably been disposed to regard diplomacy, especially the kind that Europe has principally indulged in for the past century or two, as a more or less unsavory affair which we would do well to have as little connection with as possible. The fact that Europe was content, apparently, to have America hold aloof has also been not without influence.

Hence it is that the opinion of the people of this country regarding certain questions which have lately been much discussed by the rest of the world, while apparently regarded as peculiar on the other side of the Atlantic, does not seem in the least peculiar here. The American people, for example, see no good reason why Germany, after having been roundly beaten in a war in which it was wicked enough to engage, should now be prevented from restoring its industry as fast as possible, paying its debts and war damages, and regaining if it can an honorable position in the world family. Having become accustomed of late to take economists more seriously, and historians less seriously, than they used to do, they have been a good deal influenced by Professor Keynes's book on the economic consequences of the peace, and hardly at all influenced by Professor Hazen's harsh review of the book in the New York *Times;* for they know, among other things, that Professor Keynes is an economist while Professor Hazen is not. They are strongly of the opinion that the treatment meted out to Austria by the Peace Conference, had it been perpetrated by one strong Power against a weak one, would have been universally denounced as inhuman and wicked; and they do not see why terms less severe should be applied to the transaction merely because a great many Powers, the United States included, had a hand in it. It is impossible to convince the average American that the peace arrangements, so far as Germany and Austria are concerned, are not a discreditable and wretched mess; and being, as has been said, an unsophisticated people in matters of diplomacy, it is equally impossible for the average American to see why those who did the wrong should not forthwith set themselves to right it. Germany and Austria, on the whole, are moral questions, and the American people have always been in the habit of reducing moral questions to as simple terms as possible, and of going directly at the business of settling them.

Regarding certain other questions lately much discussed, on the other hand, there is a good deal of difficulty in understanding why they should ever have been raised for this country at all. For example, the American people find it hard to see that the United States has any concern with the status of Fiume or the control of the Dardanelles. They can well understand that the settlement of territorial claims in the Adriatic is a matter of much importance to Italy and Jugoslavia, and they think that it would be very foolish of those countries to make an adjustment that might provoke war; but that, after all, is the affair of the countries concerned. So with the Dardanelles. The people of the United States have no more love for the Turk than most other nations seem to have, and if the world will be a more peaceful place with the Turk elsewhere than in Constantinople or thereabouts, they are quite willing to have him go; but it is not for them to join in removing him, or in settling the knotty problems that apparently will have to be dealt with whether he goes or stays.

What puzzles the American people is that President Wilson should have so completely misunderstood American public opinion in this whole peace business. Because the United States took a hand in the war and contributed a good deal to the Allied success, Mr. Wilson seems to have assumed that the American people wanted a voice thereafter, through him, in all the ramifications of the peace settlement, and would gladly assume a large share of responsibility for the execution of the treaty for years to come. Mr. Wilson was entirely mistaken; the American people desired no such grand and comprehensive share in future world arrangements. They were willing enough to see France recover its lost provinces, and they hope that those provinces will be happy under French rule. They were as contented as any people to see the German army and navy reduced to unimportance, and the German people mulcted in damages for so much of the losses of the war as they could afford to repay. They were even for a time much interested in a League of Nations as a device for preventing war, improving the position of international law, and bettering international relations generally; and they still think that such a league would be a good thing. But when Mr. Wilson insisted upon taking a leading part in the settlement of racial, territorial, and political controversies in which the American people had never had even a distant concern, and of which they instinctively felt that Mr. Wilson was almost as ignorant as they knew themselves to be, they drew back; while as for the League of Nations—the one thing about the peace in which they were deeply interested—they would have none of it once its true character was made clear. That is why, we believe, they repudiate Mr. Wilson. America often tolerates, even to its hurt, men who do not well represent it; but it has a way of making short work with men who misrepresent it, even if a chance to lord it over half the kingdoms is tendered as an offset.

Matters lie in about the same way with regard to France, England, and Japan. There is a great deal of sincere

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affection in the United States for France. If France were to be wantonly attacked by Germany or by any other Power, the United States would probably help if help were needed. But the American people do not desire an alliance with France, because they do not think, especially after seeing what has happened in Europe during the last generation or so, that it is good policy for them to make alliances with any Power; and they also deeply regret the military imperialism of France, the harshness of its temper toward Germany, and its fretful complaints about its losses. The friendly bonds which bind America to Great Britain are even broader and stronger than those which bind America to France; but the American people are nevertheless convinced that Britain's treatment of Egypt and India is a good deal worse than Britain would like the rest of the world to know, and that Ireland would be much happier if it were free. They are skeptical, too, about the wisdom of keeping up a colonial system any longer, especially since they are not especially proud of their own; and they are no more friendly to British imperialism, backed as it is with a huge navy and a vast amount of talk about the superiority of the British as rulers of other peoples, than they were to German imperialism and its claim of divine right. As for Japan, America has never quite made up its mind; but it feels compelled to say that so long as Shantung remains in Japanese hands, American-Japanese friendship will hang in the balance.

All of this is so simple and obvious to the average American that he wonders how any one can fail to understand it. He is well aware, however, that it is not well understood abroad, and the fact troubles him. In reality, the international relations of the United States, if the people were left to determine them, would be governed by two very simple principles—non-interference in what does not concern us, and sincere interest in peoples who are weak or oppressed. The American people are unalterably opposed to meddling in what is not their business. They are not indifferent to the welfare of other nations, and they think it proper for them to express themselves whenever a clear moral issue is presented; but in other respects they merely hope that other peoples may enjoy the same happiness of self-determination which they claim for themselves. For weak or subject peoples, on the other hand, they have a deep regard. The American nation was grounded in liberty, and toward any people that strives for liberty its sympathy goes out. America is the friend of China because China is weak, it is the friend of Armenia because Armenia is oppressed, it is the friend of Ireland because Ireland is not free. It cannot think of any foreign policy half so good as that of minding its own business, keeping out of other people's way, lending a helping hand where help is needed, and aiming at what is best for the world rather than simply at what is best for itself. It is still unsophisticated enough to believe that if other nations would follow a similar rule, the world would be a better place than it often seems when the international politicians take to manipulating it.

Mr. Chamberlain's Budget

EVERY post-war budget partakes of the nature of a rake's repentance and requires to be scrutinized in this light. Credit may fairly be given for the claim to do better in the future, but the promises and pledges to support this claim cannot expect a blind acceptance. These broad maxims are applicable to the surprisingly fine attempt made by Mr. Austin Chamberlain, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his budget speech last week. When it is remembered that the pre-war revenue and expenditure of Britain balanced at a little below 200 million pounds sterling, Mr. Chamberlain's estimate of revenue for this year at 1,418 millions, and of expenditure at 1,184 millions, leaving 234 millions for debt redemption sounds almost incredible. How is it possible that more than seven times as much revenue can be obtained than was got in 1913, and nearly 100 million pounds more than was received last year with the full burden of war-taxes unabated?

Part of the explanation is found in large adventitious aids: the attribution to the income account for two years of the heavy proceeds from the sales of war-materials which in strict bookkeeping should go to the capital account. Some 250 million pounds sterling, as compared with 300 millions for last year, stand under this head. But the main sources of this huge revenue are found in the inflated money values of all commodities and of most incomes. Before the war the accepted estimate of the aggregate national income was 2,300 million pounds. Now, with a rise of general prices near 140 per cent, distributed in enhanced profits, rents, wages, and salaries among the various classes, it cannot be less than double that sum. Only upon this supposition is it possible to account for the enormous increases of yield of income tax, super tax, and excess-profits tax, which furnish, together with customs and excise, the great bulk of the revenue. There exists, of course, no such enhanced material prosperity as is at first suggested by the yield of these taxes. On the contrary, they furnish a sinister testimony to the failure to prevent the further processes of borrowing, inflation, and rising prices, which have been continued from the time of war into the time of peace in Britain, as in other European countries, though in a less violent measure. Though the reports of the speeches in the House of Commons debate yet available do not supply close information of the yield of the various taxes upon income, it is evident that the general income tax and, still more, the excess-profits tax, have yielded results considerably in excess of the estimate. It will, no doubt, be found that last year's revenue and that for this year, will be swollen by an enormous sum from those excess profits which war profiteering and the general doubling of money-profits in all successfully conducted businesses has brought about. This source of income is, however, essentially precarious. Its yield will necessarily fall with any successful process of deflation, or with any fall of prices due to increased supply or to governmental regulations. Moreover, the revision of last year's cut of the excess-profits tax, and the return to 60 per cent for this year, is open to grave objections and is only defensible as being less objectionable than any proposed alternative.

Apart from the greatly enlarged duties upon spirits and other alcoholic drinks, the net yield of which is doubtful, the only important change proposed in the tax system is the adoption of a new tax of 5 per cent upon all profits from companies. The direct defenses of this measure are two: First, that it will provide a substantial sum, easily and certainly collected; and, secondly, that it will broaden the basis

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of taxation by means of an indirect tax extending to all "unearned" income, small as well as great. Its defects are a discouragement *pro tanto* of the advantageous process of substituting joint stock for private business enterprise, and the introduction of a new partial income tax with a highly complicated incidence. For nobody can say how far such a tax will lie where it is put, or how far it will be passed on to the consumer in a further rise of price.

Except so far as this and other indirect taxes affect the price of the necessaries of life and such conventional comforts as alcoholic liquor and tobacco, it may fairly be contended that the policy of the Government conforms to the sound principle that taxation be raised in accordance with ability to pay. Income, super tax and excess-profits tax, with certain luxury duties, fall chiefly upon the high nominal and real incomes of the rich. Although the low level at which income tax begins now brings large sections of the skilled workers within the net, the amount actually contributed by them is shown by statistics presented to the Income Tax Commission to form a very trivial proportion of the aggregate revenue. The wealthy, who, from economic necessity, were chief contributors to the war taxes, are now virtually told that they must expect to continue handing over to the Government as much as half, or even more, of their income during years of peace. In twenty years' time, when according to Mr. Chamberlain, the burden of war indebtedness will be defrayed, they may look forward to an income which "they can call their own."

There is only one way of curbing the voracity of the modern state, and that is, by a strong rally of the well-to-do classes in favor of economy. And economy hinges on policy. Now in England, at any rate, some considerable increases of civil expenditure are unavoidable. The civil estimates for this year are considerably more than double the total expenditure for all services before the war. This is, of course, largely due to increased salaries and other costs involved by the rise of prices, and, partly, to necessary extension in education, public health, and other strictly serviceable work. But vast sums are squandered upon forms of expenditure introduced as war controls and surviving under the pretext of peace emergency. Hordes of officials still crowd the purlieus of Westminster, harassing trade and helping to impede the return to normal conditions. Still worse, the war policy of subsidies for bread, coal, and railways accounts for more than ninety millions of this year's expenditure, and there is no early prospect of this vicious system coming to an end.

But the most precarious aspect of this finance rests upon the hazards of foreign policy. If the world had learnt its bitter lesson and was steadfastly moving along the path of peace, retrenchment in expenditure on armaments would speedily set finance upon an easier footing. But Britain, following the evil genius of France, committed herself to a peace with no security except the maintenance of forcible predominance, with the result that she must keep up an expenditure upon defense far exceeding the pre-war level, and add an enormous cost for the new service of the air. Nor is this the worst. What guarantee can Mr. Chamberlain pretend to give that his specious estimates of expenditure will not be exceeded by fresh demands for war expenditures in Turkey and the Balkans, and by fresh subsidies to impoverished allies?

We see, however, a sign of returning sanity among certain powerful sections of the propertied and ruling classes of Britain, in a recognition that a Europe kept deliberately dangerous by French militarism and by the enforcement of impossible terms of peace involves a more certain and a more dangerous attack upon property than any threats of socialism, or the encroachments of labor unionism. Their restiveness in the face of a confiscatory taxation which they cannot shift or evade to any great extent, is mainly responsible for the pressure on the Government to adopt a more reasonable attitude in the enforcement of the peace terms and in its Russian policy.

Caillaux

FRENCHMEN cannot understand the twenty-year sentences which American courts give to economic rebels, but their own courts have curious ways of dealing with political offenders. The confessed assassin of Jaurès was acquitted because in the excited state of public opinion the jury was persuaded that Jaurès was a good man to assassinate; Malvy was acquitted of all the crimes with which he had been charged, then convicted on a new charge without opportunity for defense and banished to Spain; and now Joseph Caillaux, former Prime Minister and four times Minister of Finance of the French Republic, has been acquitted of the charges which had kept him in jail since January, 1918, and convicted of an ambiguous crime called "commerce" or "correspondence" with the enemy.

Thus ends a long story which at times bade fair to rival the famous Dreyfus *affaire* in its capacity to stir France. Caillaux, like Dreyfus, was not cut in the pattern of a hero. He was a good hater, and his bitter personal attacks upon public men made him in turn one of the best-hated men in France. The quarrel between Caillaux and Poincaré was of long standing. Another personal feud of Caillaux led, in 1914, to the shooting of Gaston Calmette, editor of the *Figaro*, by Madame Caillaux.

Although the Socialists supported him in his stand upon the income tax and in his opposition to the three-year military service law, he was no Red; he was simply a very enlightened maintainer of the old regime. He was often miscalled a pacifist; he had not sufficient principle to be a pacifist, but his foresight warned him that unless France made peace in 1917 France would be a ruined country, and events have justified him. How far he went in his contacts with friends of Germany in Argentina and in Italy is not clear; the trial appears to have brought no evidence that he had sought to negotiate on his own account, or that he came into direct touch with France's enemies. He did consort with neutrals and with Italians whose minds were very far from the officially approved cast, and his political past was predicated upon the conviction that France must find a working basis with her eastern neighbor. The hypocrisy of the prosecution was made evident when the Prince Sixtus documents were published, revealing that while Caillaux was under suspicion in France for having met Germanophiles in Italy, Poincaré, then President of France, was sending personal emissaries to Vienna to negotiate secretly.

Caillaux was acquitted of treason, and of "intelligence" with the enemy, and of all the major charges brought against him. Of the 241 senators who sat in judgment on his case, 91 judged him entirely innocent, and 128, after the verdict was brought in, voted that there were "extenuating circumstances," whatever that may mean. Had Cail-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laux made peace in 1917, he would have been a hero; after twenty-seven months in prison, he is almost a martyr. It is too obvious that the verdict was political; some degree of guilt had to be voted, else the effect would have been too sharp a slap at Clemenceau and Poincaré. It appears that Caillaux is to be deprived for ten years of his vote and of the right to hold office. These rights will probably be restored sooner than that; for while Caillaux's present friends are the radicals, it is French finance which cannot get on without him.

What British Workers Want

THE factors driving England toward change are (1) trade union organization, which, by 1920 figures, includes 60 per cent of the adult male wage-earners in manual labor; (2) returned soldiers; (3) women; (4) more than twenty million voters on the new electoral register.

This new vast electorate has not yet been tried out in a normal time. The 1918 election was a khaki frenzy—with the soldier absent. But over a score of by-elections in Britain give opportunity for taking stock. Several things are clear. The Coalition is weakening and even tottering—but not to a final fall. There is an authentic minority who are liberal, as distinct from Tory or Labor. Labor is steadily gaining, but slowly, and remains a minority group—on the present showing it is still several years away from power. As yet, women have added two-fifths to the electorate, without greatly affecting the balance of interests. The returned soldier is far more of a factor industrially than in politics. Apparently government by groups in coalition will go on for the next one or two elections. As long as the Liberals are able to elect skilful debaters, and as long as Labor is able to elect only miners, cotton operatives, and railwaymen, the Liberals will continue as a more effective Parliamentary group in discussing foreign policy. A good deal of the voting is mere protest against a Coalition that wages informal war in various parts of the earth, fails to build houses, heaps up debt, and allows many forms of exploitation to continue. It is war weariness, seeking to vent its disillusion on victims and "devils," creating scapegoats for "the ineradicable hopelessness" of man's position in the universe after five years of waste. Of a politically convinced electorate, ready to go through on a new policy, probably not more than one-third of Britain is ready for the new social order in terms of drastic governmental change.

The Glasgow *Forward* has made an analysis of the voting as revealed in the by-elections held since the amazing khaki election of December, 1918. With the Irish remaining away, there will be 630 members; Labor will need 330 members to have a working majority. At present it has just short of 70. At the December, 1918, election Labor won 2¼ million votes on a poll of 10 million. But the register is now some 20 million. In a normal year 15 million will vote. So Labor must receive a vote of 8 million. In an analysis of the first 16 by-elections, 8 were entered by Labor candidates in a second attempt to win the seat. The Labor vote in these by-elections shows an average improvement of 30 per cent. This 30 per cent of gain would give in a 1920 general election 119 as the number of seats. Or, giving the limits, Labor would have at least 100 seats and might rise to 200. This would leave it a minority group. On certain questions, Labor and the Liberals are in agreement. A distinguished Liberal writer sums up these questions as the abolition of conscription, free trade, Home Rule for Ireland, opposition to interference with Russia, a capital levy on wealth, an acquisition-of-land measure, and opposition to tea and sugar taxes. Where the program differs is on nationalization.

England is still on the old "fodder basis" of wages: misery for a minority, and poverty for a majority of workers. Before the war she was a 29-shilling-a-week country; $7.25 a week for a man with a family. The wage gains of war have been from 100 to 120 per cent, but the cost of living has kept step, with one foot in advance. So the wage of today of from £2 10s. to £4 buys about the same amount of goods. To rise from this misery-and-poverty basis of wages will probably require reforms that are revolutionary and that will destroy the outworn economic system. In hours the workers have won notable reductions in the last year—the largest in recorded industrial history. They are generally working 44 to 48 hours, in place of 48 to 60.

Labor in Parliament lacks specialists in foreign policy. It is not that Tory and Liberal imperialists have facts proving the beneficence of machine-guns at Amritsar, and of rifle-executions in Dublin. But they have a policy—the great tradition of a drift that means extension of territory and tightening of control. Above all, they have a manner. Courteous superiority, faint amusement, the power of a well-born clan—these inherited qualities serve them well in beating down the resistances of a slightly servile psychology in the Labor group, troubled by raids and murders, but unsure of their grip on the world affairs of an imperial race.

On the home program the workers wish the enormous war debt thrown on those who stayed at home and made money. They want unemployment—2 to 10 per cent of men are out of work—made a first charge on the industry that operates because of this fringe of suffering and reserve of supply. The great key industries and services wish public ownership, and a system of joint control between the public and the workers, in which all grades of producers by hand and brain will participate. The "sweated" trades wish the protection of national minima in hours, wages, safety, sanitation, and health. The Trades Boards, supplying certain of these minima, are beginning to reach about two million workers. That portion of unskilled labor which is organized wishes wages and hours, a stable position in the community. They are one of the least revolutionary elements in the whole group. They number a million and a quarter.

In general, what Labor seeks is the alliance of the manual worker with the technical man in the production of goods. That production will be aimed at the necessities of the consuming public, instead of the luxuries of a rich group. It will build houses, for instance, instead of automobile factories, when there is a shortage of houses. There will probably be salaries paid to ability, commensurate to the service rendered (instead of the present starvation wages for the creators of value). The worker has revolted against a life that centers round the machine as the master of his daily work, and against the profit-making system. The revolt against the machine is expressed in the demands for shorter hours and more workers' control. The revolt against profits is expressed in the demands for higher wages and nationalization of key industries. The British workers believe that the motive of profit-making was stimulating to business men, but benumbing to industry, because it neglected to supply a motive for the actual producers—manual, managerial, and technical.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Case Against the Injunction

By GEORGE SOULE

IN 1919 the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America—the national union of operatives in the men's clothing industry—made a collective agreement with the Clothiers' Exchange of Rochester, New York. This agreement was similar to those already in force in the great clothing centers of the country—New York, Chicago, Baltimore, Boston, and so on. It included, on the one side, the important manufacturers, and, on the other, the clothing workers of the city, organized in a single industrial union. It established standard wage rates and hours, specified conditions of work, and set up a highly developed system of "impartial machinery" for adjustment of minor disputes which might arise. The agreement recognized the union as a legitimate factor in the industry, and formed an industrial constitution of the most modern sort.

One firm, however, Michaels, Stern and Company, was not satisfied to abandon the old system. It resigned from the Clothiers' Exchange, discharged members of the Amalgamated in its shops, and maintained a spy system to betray the union. The union thereupon called a strike against the outside firm in order to bring it within the circle of industrial constitutionalism. Michaels, Stern and Company, in search for a strike-breaking agency, went to a rival union—the United Garment Workers. This is an obsolescent body which, in spite of its recognition by the American Federation of Labor, has lost control of the clothing workers through autocratic and ineffective methods characteristic of the old, conservative unionism. Its President, contrary to the decision of his subordinates, granted a charter upon the request of the employer, and a dummy union was set up in the Michaels, Stern shop. Finding this device insufficient to quell the trouble they had aroused, the firm retired from the field of modern economic action to the ancient citadel of the law. They secured an injunction against the Amalgamated, and entered a suit for damages.

Injunctions in labor cases have been fought many times in the courts, and Mr. Gompers denounces them with regularity. But never yet has another injunction proceeding been tried in accordance with the practice established by such counsel as Justice Brandeis and others in the Oregon ten-hour and eight-hour cases—a practice which introduces the full economic facts into the testimony, and settles the principle once for all. The Amalgamated, with its customary foresight and vigor, saw that this was an opportunity to bring the law up to the level of economic reality, and to clear an annoying obstacle from the path of American labor. It therefore engaged eminent counsel, including Emory R. Buckner of New York, who induced Felix Frankfurter to enter the case on account of its public interest, and prepared economic exhibits with the assistance of such experts in statistics as Leo Wolman of the New School for Social Research. The case, which is now being tried in the New York Supreme Court at Rochester, is therefore likely to prove a *cause célèbre* for labor.

An explanation of the relevancy of the economic facts to the legal question will show how important those facts are. When a court issues an injunction against a union forbidding it to practice acts which are not in themselves unlawful—such as peaceful picketing, persuading employees to leave an employer, and the like—it does so on the assumption that the injury to the employer is the work of malice rather than an incident in the pursuit of an object justifiable and legal in itself—such as benefit to the members of the union. That courts should ever make such an assumption may be astonishing; nevertheless they have often done so. The questions to be decided, therefore, are, in the language of the defendant's brief: "(1) Was the union actuated by a legitimate motive of bettering the economic condition of its members and of the trade, and (2) did the acts which are complained of bear a direct relation, as a reasonable means, toward the achievement of this lawful end? More concretely, has a national union a legitimate interest in the conditions prevailing in a particular shop, and is unionization of that shop a reasonable means of vindicating that interest?" To answer these questions requires an examination of the method and results of collective bargaining on a national scale, and an exposition of the necessity of union tactics as a means of enforcing collective bargaining. If they are answered affirmatively by the court, the union, with its practice, is acknowledged by law as a desirable factor in the national economy. The economic exhibits are of the broadest interest, because they tend to show the nation's need for the union.

Ten years ago the men's clothing industry was, from the point of view of labor, in a condition of hopeless chaos. Clothing was manufactured in a great number of establishments, and only a few of these were "inside shops"—that is, shops which carried on all the processes, from the cloth to the finished garment, within their walls. Much of the work was given out to irresponsible contractors or done in the homes, and as a consequence "sweating" was prevalent. Employers could not be held responsible for hours, wages, or conditions of work, and all were at the most degrading level. Workers toiled in dark, crowded, and insanitary tenements for as many hours as they could keep awake, and received a bare pittance. Competition for employment among the workers, and for work among the contractors, was so keen that there seemed no hope of improvement. The obstacles in the way of organization by the unions themselves seemed insuperable. The whole matter was the subject of many investigations and became a public scandal, but public opinion, charity, and the law itself were powerless to help. Repeated strikes, coming at the beginning of the busy seasons, were merely unorganized revolts of the toilers against intolerable conditions, and resulted in no permanent benefits because the renewed competition among the workers, when the dull season overtook them, enabled the employers—in fact, forced them—to withdraw any previous concessions. Moreover, on account of the large number and instability of the employers, concessions were not universally applied, and competition among contractors and manufacturers acted constantly to depress standards.

Small craft unions, the good will of individual employers, trade agreements covering insignificant parts of the industry—none of these were, of course, effective in the circumstances. At length the workers adopted the only methods that could be effective—and kept on developing their union technique to such a point that they now stand at the van of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the American labor movement. General strikes of workers of all crafts, gaining recognition for a powerful and democratic industrial union, and collective agreements enforced throughout the industry by a continuous machinery of adjustment—these things have within a surprisingly short period organized the clothing industry and given the workers a taste of what it is to live. Where the union is in control the sweatshop is virtually abolished, subcontracting within the shops is abolished, homework is abolished, hours are limited to forty-four a week, wages are standardized at reasonable levels, appeal against unfair discharge is always open, strikes are infrequent and guerrilla warfare minimized, machinery exists for the prompt adjustment of disputes, and seasonal variations are decreased. The union has proved itself the only cohesive force which can substitute government for anarchy in this region. If it were removed or materially restricted there would be little to prevent the worst sweatshop conditions reappearing within a few months. Here is a case where the control of labor over production is in large measure already effective, and is demonstrably beneficial not only to the workers but to the general welfare.

The demonstration of these facts to the court rests upon the economic exhibits submitted. These explain the succession of settlements which have been achieved, with their progressively improved provisions; the constantly enlarging circle of workers coming under the agreements; the increases of wages and the decreases of hours in the various centers, organized and unorganized, showing the effect of unionization; the operation of the conciliation and arbitration machinery in settling disputes and preventing strikes. They also show the constructive policy of the union in regard to the introduction of improved machinery and methods of increasing production without injury to the workers. An important section demonstrates the inter-relation of the various markets, proving that the union has a legitimate interest in bringing all clothing establishments within the scope of its control.

This evidence, supported by expert testimony of economists and labor managers, some of them representing employers and the government, the plaintiff will find it difficult to controvert. He has, however, two other important lines of attack. One is the charge that the methods used to enforce collective bargaining were in themselves illegal, involving "threats," "intimidation," "force," "boycotts," "inducing breach of contract." In each of these cases the defense will insist on accurate definitions of words which are too often used loosely in labor cases. They will argue that threats need not be threats of unlawful measures; that force is not illegal, if it is not physical but economic force; that, in short, it is possible for unions to employ measures loosely called by these names without violating the law in any particular.

The other plea of the plaintiff strikes deeper. It is that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers form a "revolutionary" union, and that its ultimate aim is not so much the benefit of its members in wages and hours as the abolition of the capitalist order. A member of the counsel for the plaintiff was also of counsel for the Lusk committee, and the bias of that learned body will undoubtedly be exploited to the full. In support of this contention also will be found the rival and conservative United Garment Workers, which in its struggle against the Amalgamated has always appealed to the anti-socialists, and has lately been trying to turn to its advantage the crusade against "radicalism." What answer the defense will make to this charge has not yet been disclosed, but the truth is clear. The Amalgamated is avowedly a socialist union, and will not conceal the fact that it aspires to the elimination of the control of the private owner over industry. It proclaims the "class struggle" in the preamble to its constitution. It can contend with complete candor, however, that it does not violate the law in declaring its aspiration for a socialist commonwealth, and that it is not plotting an unlawful dispossession of the private owner or a violent overthrow of the state. It can point to its rapidly increased control over the industry, gained by peaceable methods, and ask what there is to hinder a continuation of the same process. It can show a practical identity between its aim and the benefits it has already gained for its members. Only through the limitation of private control, and the increase of labor's control, have the improvements it has already achieved become possible. If the court would permit speculation about the future, the defense might even go on to indicate how present maladjustments in the industry, harmful both to labor and the public, could be removed by the elimination of private ownership and the substitution of a collectivist or a guild system. But of course neither the court nor the lawyers will venture so far as that.

It is fortunate that a body like the Amalgamated, which represents the most advanced and successful union practice not only in its relation with the employers but in its attitude toward industrial problems, its constructive socialist philosophy, and its broad and democratic structure—a highly evolved structure which there is not space here even to begin to describe—should have undertaken to establish a firm foothold for the union within the law. Whether or not it obtains a favorable decision, it will have made a larger contribution to the public and official understanding of labor problems than a dozen Industrial Conferences in Washington.

Paris Remembers the Commune

By IDA O'NEIL

Paris, March 18

RED banners in the sun; giant squares of crimson; a fleet of sails in the wind. Children and women in white; red ribbons; flowers; long files of men, each with a flaming boutonnière. Silence. The procession stretches out interminable in the white dust, under the rows of chestnuts dotted with faint green. Far ahead the standards pass under a stone archway. A song comes out from the dark interior of the Salle de la Mairie, growing in volume as the cortège advances. The last flutter of white, the last flash of red vanishes under the arch. The hall within pulsates, thunders, brims over with sound. The corridors sing, the stairways. The melody leaks through all the cracks of the old building. It falls like a cascade from the open windows. The walls reverberate to the rhythm, harsh as the clash of cymbals:

Groupons-nous et demain
L'internationale sera le genre humain!

* * * * *

Boulevard Voltaire. Five thousand crowd the padded benches of the Gymnase, hunched in an attitude symbolic of centuries of waiting. On the platform, Albert Doyen and his orchestra and chorale of the Fêtes du Peuple. Behind him, in silhouette against a scarlet background, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shrewd features of Frossard, secretary of the Party, and the fine head of Paul Boncour—singularly reminiscent of the Gentleman from Carolina, Kentucky, or Virginia, in his aristocratic aloofness. Wagner, Bach, Beethoven, Handel. Hymns to Peace, to Reason, to Liberty—a hyphen of music joins past to present. The present speaks in a somber folk chant of the Volga. "Bis, bis!" thunders the hall.

Paul Boncour speaks. Traditional homage to the martyrs of the Commune. "Heroes—yes, but . . ." The audience stirs in uneasy silence. "But we understand today what they did not understand. A revolution is not a matter of fine enthusiasm—the affair of a March morning. It demands long years, preparation, organization. . . ." The silence grows glacial. Here and there a murmur: "He's afraid." "He's trying to straddle." The speaker continues. "Far be it from me to discourage the revolutionary temper of certain of my comrades; but the hour is grave . . . vast problems . . . Germany . . . We must not relinquish certain old principles . . . defense nationale." A roar of rage salutes the word. Boncour takes his seat in an angry clamor. Voices rise above the confusion. "Traitor!" "He would unchain new wars!" Some one in the gallery starts a familiar couplet:

Debout les damnés de la terre!
Debout les forçats de la faim!

Many voices take up the melody. It grows insistent, but dies away again as the orchestra attacks the first drum-like rhythm of the Seventh Symphony.

* * * * *

Montmartre. The narrow hall reeks with the fumes of tobacco and sweat. Mechanics in greasy trousers; bakers, pale and floury; boys in the black pinafore of the communal schools; women, hatless and intent. The man on the platform speaks simply, intimately. There is no need of oratory. He is one of them. "This is revolutionary ground. A stone's throw away were the cannon of the Commune, the barricades. . . . Your fathers were the first to die. . . ."

The silence is broken by a swift outburst of applause, harsh and sudden as a blow. Past and present press close together—join. Children of the Commune, intelligent, savage. Violence in leash—the leash wears thin.

"Our fathers . . . dead for the Commune. Vive la Commune! Vive la Commune de demain!"

* * * * *

A.R.A.C. (Association Républicaine des Anciens Combattants). A league of fighters; a league against war. The hearers are young; so, too, the speakers. On the platform the fine intellectual head, the gaunt frame of Raymond Lefebvre, the frank boyish smile of Vaillant-Couturier.

Here speaks only the present.

"We know the cost of such action as theirs (the Communards'). We also know the necessity. . . . France is dying. The regime that brought on war will bring about other wars. . . . It must be revolution . . . or death. May it be one of peace. We have had enough of bloodshed. But if it cannot be, what is a year of revolution compared to a day of international warfare? Remember May, 1917!

"Today Germany has begun to understand. Yet there are those who talk of armed intervention." The voice of the speaker is lost in a shout from hundreds of throats: "Never! Never!" A man leaps to his feet in the first row of the audience. His face is cut horizontally by a cruel white scar. Turning toward the hall he cries a phrase the words of which escape me. But the crowd has heard. There is an explosion of sound: "Vivent les camarades allemands! Vive l'Allemagne communiste!"

Italian Workers as Their Own Employers

By HIRAM K. MODERWELL

Turin, Italy, March 18

IN the textile factories of the Brothers Mazzonis, near Turin, Italy, there broke out some months ago a very ordinary labor dispute, with a very extraordinary result. The "affair Mazzonis" has become a test problem for all adepts of theoretical political economy.

The employees, whose union the Mazzonis refused to recognize, demanded the same wages and working conditions as had been granted in other similar factories by the Association of Textile Manufacturers to the Textile Workers' Federation. The Mazzonis refused. The employees struck. The government arbitration court in Turin took cognizance of the dispute and summoned the two parties to appear before it. The employees' representative appeared; the Mazzonis refused. The court rendered its decision, granting in substance the demands of the workers. But the arbitration court had no legal authority to compel the acceptance of its awards. It recommended. Then it urged. The Mazzonis insisted that their factories were theirs. They did not recognize the competence of the court. They were willing to reopen their factories at any time, and after their employees had returned to work they "would take into consideration all justified demands."

So far the story of the affair Mazzonis is identical with a thousand others in Europe and America. The outcome is what has so upset public opinion in Italy.

The workers met one day toward the end of February, and decided to take possession of the factories and operate them themselves. They formed a parade and marched, with red flags at their head, to their places of employment. They raised the red flags over the factories, declared the establishments the property of the people, appointed a factory council from among their number, went to their several posts, and set to work. The military was on guard, of course, but did nothing. No doubt the officer in command sent to Turin for instructions. If he did, the officials must have had a bad half hour. The Italian Government has for fifteen months been telling the workers, in speeches, in editorials, in pictures, that they must "produce," to save Italy from economic ruin. Especially has production been essential in the textile industry. And the picture of government troops forcibly preventing workingmen from producing a socially necessary article would have been too grotesque. The soldiers stood quietly by while the workers took possession of the Mazzonis factories in the name of the people. Observers who went from Milan and Turin to inspect the experiment in the next few days marvelled at the orderliness and efficiency which reigned under the red flag.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The day after the seizure of the factories, the Secretary of the Camera del Lavoro, or regional labor federation, of Turin, in conjunction with the national secretary of the Textile Workers' Federation, sent the following telegram to Dante Ferraris, Minister of Commerce, in Rome: "Workers Torre Pellice, Ponte Canavese, facing irreducible willful stubbornness Mazzonis firm, in view of inutility every effort toward conciliatory solution, have taken possession factories. Precise, absolute intention which inspires workers is work henceforth without Mazzonis. Italian Federation Textile Workers Camera Lavoro Turin, assuming full responsibility for completed act said workers, who, counseled and assisted by said organizations, advise Government that wherever occur acts oppression, coercion tending to impede orderly labor workers management, entire Turin proletariat supported by Italian proletariat, will rise solidly defense comrades; advise further that work having today commenced confident expectation supply raw materials on part Government and cotton manufacturers' association, for continued production. As already reported verbally to your Excellency, Milan communal corporation willing undertake sale textile products manufactured Mazzonis under workers management further assuring anticipatory financing. Present moment however obvious reasons suggest proposition to Government as we formally propose with this telegram that all products of said factory pass with governmental interests control financing to cooperatives to be sold poorer classes honest prices. Remain at disposition your Excellency for explanations, elucidations, agreements."

The workers found in the factories stores of coal and raw materials for three or four months. But they were looking more than three or four months ahead. They sent their emissaries to the Socialist municipality of Milan. The Milan communal bank, which finances various enterprises of social utility such as the construction of dwellings, agreed to furnish them working capital to cover running expenses. The municipal coöperative society agreed to buy the whole of their product at market rates. A group of cotton manufacturers in Milan contracted to furnish them with the necessary raw materials; if these men should change their minds, their workers would perhaps be able to keep them to their agreement. If the Mazzonis workmen should later be in want of coal, it is probable the municipality of Milan would see that they got it. Thus a whole network of Socialist institutions seems to assure the peaceful and prosperous operation of the Mazzonis factories under the red flag for an indefinite period.

The question for all economic theorists is: What should a government, based on the inviolability of private property, do in such a case? Two things are clear: first, that whereas the workers committed an illegal act, the behavior of the Mazzonis brothers, with regard to their property, was legally unexceptionable; second, that whereas the correct behavior of the Mazzonis was in the highest degree damaging to the state and the community, the illegal act of the workers vitally served, and in no way harmed, the public interest.

The Government then has its choice between condoning an illegal act or damaging the interests of the community. The right of private property and the right of public welfare are here in the sharpest contrast.

First, every sane person will admit that it is morally impossible for the Government to drive the peaceful workers out of the Mazzonis factories by means of artillery and machine guns, to say nothing of the physical difficulty of defeating the red guard which the workers have organized for their defense. But perhaps there is some way of protecting the public interest in such a case without violating the right of the Mazzonis brothers to their private property. It has been suggested in Italy that the Government should manage the factories, setting aside the profits to the account of the Mazzonis. But, in economic theory, the Mazzonis have a right to the profits because they assume the risks; if the Government assumes the risks have the Mazzonis any claim upon the profits? The practical difficulties of the proposal are still greater: the next time the Mazzonis workmen demand an increased wage to meet the ever increasing cost of living, is the Government to refuse the demand, or increase the price of the product to the public, in order to protect the Mazzonis's profits? On the other hand, if the Government does not protect the profits of the owners, what becomes of their rights to their private property?

Another suggestion is that the Government should sell the factories at auction to the highest bidder and deposit the sale price to the Mazzonis's account. But what if the new owner should turn out to be another Mazzonis? Nothing would then be settled, and the Government would have the same comedy to play all over again. To say that the difficulty would not recur if the new owner accepted the demands of the workers or the findings of the court, is to hold that he will be able to retain his title over the property he has purchased only if he consents to renounce a portion of his legal control over it.

Another obvious comment is that the award of the arbitration court should have been obligatory. This suggestion involves the whole question of compulsory arbitration. What is certain is that this system constitutes a species of semi-public property to be administered in the interest not of the owner but of the community. Here again, however, the theoretical difficulties are far less serious than the practical. A compulsory arbitration court would, humanly speaking, necessarily render judgment either for the one party or for the other. The Government would thus become, or at least seem to become, a class instrument, and the political struggle for the control of it would become more and more an economic class struggle. The right, in effect, to dispose of the profits of industrial capital would pass to the class controlling the political machinery. It is needless to point out how long a step this is from any accepted theory of private property.

The most plausible suggestion is that the Mazzonis brothers be denied the management of their property but guaranteed its value—in other words, that the property be condemned under some form of right of eminent domain, and paid for in annual installments out of the profits. This solution would perhaps satisfy the existing law. But if it were made the standard solution of all future Mazzonis cases, the indemnified capitalist could re-invest his capital only at the risk of being driven out again at the next repetition of the situation. In Italy today one can readily imagine the Mazzonis money being chased from pillar to post before the increasing aggressions of the labor unions.

It remains to record the way the Italian Government found out of its embarrassing situation. A day or two after the *fait accompli* on the part of the employees, it requisitioned the Mazzonis factories in the following de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cree: "In view of the fact that the Firm Mazzonis has refused to appear before the Commission of Conciliation and that the attitude of said firm, which has refused to recognize the judgment pronounced in conformity with the laws of the state and has sought to elude the enforcement thereof, constitutes an offense against the law; in view of the fact that the illegal attitude of the Firm Mazzonis is liable to produce grave disturbances to public order and that other consequences still more grave might result therefrom; in view of the fact that the same grave reasons of public necessity and of impelling exigencies of national economy which counsel the transference of industrial disputes to the Commission of Conciliation render necessary the intervention of the state, it is decreed:

"That the cotton manufacturing establishments of the Firm Mazzonis existing in the communes of Turin, Torre Pellice, Luserna San Giovanni, Pont Canavese, and Favria, are requisitioned by the state.

"That Cavaliere Mario Fusconi, chief inspector of industry and labor in Turin, is charged with the administration of the establishments indicated above to the account of the Firm Mazzonis."

The state (making a clean sweep of all the Mazzonis factories, and not merely of the two which were seized) advances in this decree a charge of illegal conduct against the brothers Mazzonis which could scarcely be maintained in court. It may be, perhaps, that they were legally under obligations to *appear* before the arbitration court, but as the *Corriere della Sera* points out they were in no wise obliged to apply the court's award. The pretext may be generously allowed to a government which is harrassed by all the details of an almost insoluble national economic problem.

In the meantime no one envies the task of the Cavaliere Mario Fusconi. He must soon make up his mind whether the industry confided to his stewardship shall be administered for the benefit of the absentee proprietors Mazzonis —who now are certainly contributing to the enterprise neither "initiative," "risk," "inventiveness," nor "superior brains," none of the classical virtues, in fact, which are commonly ascribed to the capitalists—or for the benefit of the community, including the workers who are now doing all the work of production. He will doubtless be diplomatic in his approach to a factory soviet protected by a red guard. One may venture to predict that so long as the workers show themselves capable of administering the factories in a business-like and economical manner, however much to the profit of themselves or of the poor, he will confine his activities to writing "O. K." on their books.

The Steel-Makers

By HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY

THE steel strike, begun on September 22, was officially called off on January 8. Its failure was widely proclaimed, the *Iron Age* on January 15 commenting thus:

> A main reason for its failure was the record of its principal leader as an advocate of industrial revolution and of doctrines threatening property rights. Public opinion was strongly influenced against the strikers also by the attitude of defiance of the Government shown in the early stages of the coal strike, also by labor union advocacy of the Plumb plan for employee management of the railroads. Later came the discovery of revolutionary plots against the Government and the wholesale arrests of aliens in all parts of the country. The combination of these disturbing developments intensified the popular feeling produced by the fact that foreign workers made up in large part the unions that had been newly formed in the steel plants. Thus the whole atmosphere of the strike was calculated to array the public against the strikers and to foredoom it to failure.

It would be injudicious to quarrel with such an authority as the *Iron Age* on any question connected with the steel industry, and it is perhaps *lèse majesté* to the rulers of the iron and steel kingdom to raise any question of their success in breaking the strike. Yet even brief observation of some of the conditions in such steel centers as Pittsburgh, Johnstown, Youngstown, Cleveland, and Gary is calculated to lead to disagreeable questionings: Was the strike a failure? Who actually won, and why?

Judge Gary's attitude, consistently maintained, left no doubt whatever what the strike was about. There were grievances, notably the twelve-hour day, as the strikers' demands showed; and the honest investigator can easily satisfy himself that the strike was essentially a trade-union struggle of the old type, not a wild, revolutionary undertaking, incited by "red" agitators, despite the happy discovery of Mr. Foster's little tract on syndicalism. At bottom the strike was a struggle for the right to organize. This right the despised foreigner demanded; this right Judge Gary and his associated employers denied, though of course they are in favor of organization "of the right kind." But organization of the men's kind they opposed with all the resources of unlimited wealth, unrestrained industrial power, and unexampled control over the agencies of local government, notably in the State of Pennsylvania. With these resources they broke the strike, but it appears doubtful if they won the victory; they are still fighting the enemy.

To take a single example, Johnstown was a center of hard fighting in the strike—a "scab-hole," the union men call it, controlled by the Cambria Steel Company. After being overwhelmingly defeated in the primaries by the union candidate, C. A. McKeown, Joseph Cauffiel was chosen Mayor last November. Two weeks later the mills opened, and gradually operations were resumed. On December 29 the rooms of the Labor Temple were broken into, and the charters and ledgers of eleven unions were carried off. On January 8, the day after the steel strike was called off, Mayor Cauffiel wrote the following letter:

> MR. GOMER WALTERS, Agent.
> Dear Sir:
>
> You, as agent for the Ellis Estate, are renting to the Labor Temple the building at the corner of Main and Market Streets and said tenants are a nuisance and in compliance with the law I serve notice on you to abate said nuisance within a period of ten days. If said nuisance is not abated on or before that time you will be asked to appear before the city court and answer charges in compliance with the Commonwealth and fail not at your peril.
>
> Very truly yours,
> JOSEPH CAUFFIEL, Mayor

At latest reports the nuisance of which the mayor com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plained was not yet abated, and the fight goes steadily on.

Meanwhile, what of the defeated strikers? Their frame of mind is interesting. The unions of course are disorganized; the dues-paying membership was reduced to a small number; and the external incidents are those of a lost strike. Yet there is manifest no discouragement and no admission of defeat. There is recognition of a lost skirmish, along with quiet cheerfulness and unruffled confidence in the future. What does it mean? It gives at any rate the impression of a fresh triumph of ideas over force. The remarkable orderliness of the strikers throughout the contest, even in face of severe and deliberate provocation, has been widely noted. Less well known is the fundamental change that appears to have taken place in the ideas of the steel workers. During the generation that has elapsed since the breaking of the Homestead strike, the power of the steel companies has been absolute. Changes and improvements have come, but as the result of company action, the workers being mere pawns on the board, and thinking of themselves as such. The acts of the Steel Trust, like acts of God, were facts to be reckoned with, but in no way influenced, perhaps not even by men's prayers. Now for the first time the foreigners in the mills have got the idea that they can perhaps accomplish something in opposition to the steel companies. They have discovered that by simply standing together, with folded arms, they could stop the mills, and that not all the power of the companies and the State constabulary and the local authorities could make the chimneys smoke. This idea the companies could not afford to have implanted; by implanting it the organizers have perhaps gained the only real victory in the contest, for out of this idea will come fundamental changes.

Another idea has struck root. For many years reformers have fulminated against the twelve-hour day, but the twelve-hour day has not disappeared. Now the dream of a reasonable workday has floated in the mind of the men in the mills, and the twelve-hour day is marked for destruction, because satisfied labor is essential to production. Listen again to the *Iron Age:*

> The twelve-hour day under present conditions of labor supply cannot be abolished at once, but there can be and should be a steady bending of effort looking to its eventual abolition. Moreover, means must be devised for a better expression of the good will the steel companies hold toward their employees. The military system that has long prevailed in the industry makes no such expression.

What is actually taking place is significant. Everywhere in the steel towns there has been labor shortage. There has been an exodus of workers, especially of foreigners who have taken the opportunity of returning to the old country now the war is over. Many of them will never come back; and notwithstanding the sudden enthusiasm of the companies for "American" workers when it was discovered that the foreigners were the backbone of the strike, these husky sons of southern and southeastern Europe will be sorely missed in the mills where they have so long done the unskilled work. Other men, drifting into other occupations and other localities, have likewise done their last day's work at the furnaces and mills. Shaken out of the old rut by the strike, they have discovered that they can at need get a new job, and many of them are finding the new work more attractive than the old, no matter what the conditions of pay. Efforts to bring in outside labor have not been too successful. Importation of Negro workers has produced race antagonism rather than steel. The companies are slow in recovering from the disorganization occasioned by the strike, and delays, accidents, and loss of material have long continued to vex the mill superintendents.

Most serious of all, however, is probably the discontent of the men. The *Iron Age,* in its issue of January 1, declared: "The labor situation, so far as better feeling is concerned, has not been improved by the events of the year, and that fact constitutes one of the uncertainties regarding 1920." Two weeks later its Pittsburgh correspondent stated:

> A steel plant or a finishing mill may be running to 95 per cent. of normal capacity as far as number of men at work is concerned, but the chances are this same concern is not turning out more than 75 to 80 per cent of normal production. This comes about largely from the inefficiency of the men, who are not putting forth their best efforts to get out maximum production, which is so badly needed. A case in point is that of a leading tin plate mill which reports 100 per cent men at work with an actual output of only slightly over 80 per cent.

All the leaders of the men come back to dissatisfaction as the ultimate fact in the present situation, the fact that is compelling the companies, after breaking the strike, to begin to yield to the demands of the workers. Their point of view is well represented in the issue of the Iron and Steel Workers' Bulletin for February 5, published in four languages under the caption "Steel Strikers Winning":

> In all the newspapers last week appeared the news that the U. S. Steel Corporation had granted a 10 per cent. increase in wages to the laborers in the steel mills. The same papers said the wages of those other than laborers would be "equitably adjusted." That means they will get a little raise, but only the laborers will get the 10 per cent.
>
> The steel workers will understand that this is one of the first improvements that has come to them because of their great strike. It was the laborers who struck. It is they who win. They were the ones who were dissatisfied and who struck. It is they who get the biggest increase in wages in the hope that they will be satisfied. . . .
>
> The strikers are beginning to get results from their strike. They are not talking about deporting them any more. They are raising their wages so they will stay in the mills.
>
> The steel industry will never go back to the old days when the workers were no better than slaves. They have their eyes open now. They have learned about their rights. They have learned how to fight. They have seen how they can win. They are winning. They are going to win more.
>
> Unions are going to stay in the steel industry. The unions will not have as hard a fight again as in the big strike. The bosses know the power of the unions now. The bosses always respect power.
>
> More power to the workers! More power to the steel-workers!

It is the consciousness of power that has come to the steel-workers. How they will use that power time alone can tell. They have had many bad lessons from both the companies and the public authorities, who have used their power ruthlessly against the strikers. If such lessons are to be continued, the teachers need not be surprised if their pupils turn their lessons against those who have taught them. For the present, however, there is no indication of any purpose except to rebuild the organization and carry forward the struggle along strictly legal lines, no matter what illegality is employed on the other side. When the weather again allows, the organizers will once more hold outdoor meetings in the steel district. In Pennsylvania they expect once more to be arrested for holding meetings without a permit, blocking traffic, or any other of the ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cuses that have been alleged for the breaking up of orderly gatherings. This case they will carry to the people of the State, through the central labor bodies, the labor papers, whatever medium they can find; and gradually they hope to win the State to their view, because they are confident of the inherent justice and rightness of their case. This is the position of strong men; repression and bludgeonings can never overthrow it, though they may conceivably in time turn it to revolt. But at bottom this is an attack of ideas, and against it only ideas can prevail. It is high time for the authorities and the companies to realize the nature of the task that confronts them. If these men be wrong in demanding a share in determining the conditions of their own life and work, let them be shown why; but if not, then let those who have heretofore ruled them turn with honesty and good will and patience to the more difficult task of co-operating with them, for the day of the "Cossack" has passed. The men who control our mines of iron and coal, our furnaces and mills, bear the responsibility of meeting an imperative demand for iron and steel. The steel-workers have a veto over their power to meet it. The steel strike, unless all indications fail, has created new conditions of production. Will the owners be wise enough to recognize those new conditions by "recognizing labor"?

"Ca'-Canny" in Japan

By MILES M. SHEROWER

BENEATH the superficial calm of Japan's industrial life dynamic forces are at work that may at any moment break out and overturn the social and industrial organization of the country. As the aggressive spirit of labor develops, critical observers are watching with acute interest to see what form the inevitable labor upheaval will take. Will it follow the conservative trade union methods of the American Federation of Labor? Will it take the political form of the British labor movement? Or will it follow the course of least resistance, employing the methods of sabotage and developing along the lines of syndicalism or Bolshevism? Such is the problem that is today confronting the student of Far Eastern affairs.

Japan is the only advanced nation where labor unions are forbidden by law. A labor organizer and agitator of the mild type of Samuel Gompers would be imprisoned by the police on the charge of spreading "dangerous thoughts." With the sensational rise in the cost of the laborer's barest necessities (food, clothing, and shelter have jumped nearly 400 per cent since 1913), the industrial population of Japan was faced with a dilemma for which the "kindness principle" which had always been considered the ideal to be aimed at in the relations of employer and employee offered no immediate solution. And in the land where the word "strike" was not even in the vocabulary, there occurred in 1915, 1916, and 1917 spontaneous risings of factory workers with clearly defined demands for increased wages and shorter hours. Without any definite forms of co-operation or organization those incidents increased until the fatal "rice riots" of August, 1918, which might easily have resulted in a revolution and the overthrow of the Japanese monarchy had there been an articulate leader—a Lenin or Trotzky—to focus the people's demands. In spite of bitter persecution by the police authorities of those revolutionary spirits who upheld the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, the number of strikes continued to increase to an alarming degree, and in the spring and summer of 1919 the strike fever spread even to government arsenals, naval yards, the principal copper mines, and to most of the monopolistic enterprises such as the tramway systems and the tobacco monopoly.

The undisguised government intimidation of strikers, and more particularly of their spokesmen, has given a novel twist to the struggle between labor and capital in Japan. Balked and terrorized by the police if they threw down their tools and walked out of the shop, the workers, without the assistance of members of the I. W. W., Bolshevist agitators, or "dangerous thinkers," have evolved the idea of securing their demands by making non-compliance with their request costly and even ruinous to their employer. And so it has come about that a new word has been coined in the Japanese language—"go slow." In a remarkably short time the Japanese worker, forced by circumstance, has become a past master in the art of making the "go slow" process a more effective weapon than the strike. The expert lathe hand spoils a costly job by a "mistake"; riveters who have done their work perfectly for years acquire a knack for putting the wrong rivet in the right place; carpenters seem to lose all skill with their tools; even the ignorant coolies devise a most ingenious method of carrying a load of material three times around the block in order to bring it across the street.

This "go slow" method was employed for the first time in the history of Japanese labor at the Kawasaki Dockyards, one of the largest shipbuilding establishments in the Orient where the workers were receiving anywhere from eighteen to fifty yen per month.* The 18,000 seemingly unorganized employees, through a committee, presented a petition to the president asking for a fifty per cent increase in their wages, the immediate payment of a bonus long overdue, a further bonus to be paid every six months, and decent sanitary accommodations and dining rooms to be furnished by the company. The president, Kojiro Matsukata, an educated man and one of the greatest industrialists in the country, made half-hearted replies to the last three demands, but completely ignored the request for the fifty per cent increase in wages. The "go slow" strike, decided upon beforehand by the men, immediately went into effect and President Matsukata was dumbfounded and overwhelmed by this unexpected stroke on the part of his previously humble employees. The police were called in; the courts were appealed to for assistance; the ringleaders were arrested; the men were lectured, coerced, and bullied; and finally the company played its trump card—the lockout. But with ships on the ways which had to be delivered in contract time, such tactics were of no avail, and within ten days of the beginning of the strike the company conceded the demands of the workers practically in their entirety.

This strike was no sooner settled than a strike along similar lines broke out in the Osaka Iron Works, another of the

*One yen is approximately equal to 50 cents.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

big shipbuilding companies. The struggle was short and decisive with the workers completely victorious.

The menace to Japanese industry in this novel situation lies in the mob spirit and imitative character of the Japanese populace. Were the newspapers to maintain complete silence about the development of the "go slow" strikes, the news would nevertheless spread throughout the Empire. And what was successful in Kobe or Osaka can be tried as easily in Tokio, Nagasaki, or any other industrial centre. And it is harder to drive an idea out of the mind of the Japanese worker than it is to drive a new one in; especially when the idea the authorities are opposing is one that has demonstrated its potency to bring about quick results in a field where nothing had previously been effective.

And so the statesmen and the business men and the politicians, big and small, are all putting their heads together and are looking for a panacea that will cure their accumulated industrial ills. The most original of the many proposed schemes is one that has been discussed in Seiyukai circles. (The Seiyukai is the majority party at present in control of the Imperial Diet.) It is proposed to place the entire industrial population on a working card license basis. Every worker at present employed is to be registered and given a card without which no employer is permitted to engage him. The police are to have complete records of all registrations. If any worker or group of workers is caught fomenting disorder their work cards are immediately to be taken away from them and they shall be denied any future opportunity at industrial occupation. Strikes and lockouts are to be prohibited by statute.

No labor union in the western sense of the word is to be permitted in Japan, but the workers in any factory may at any time individually or collectively petition the judge of the local district court for an advance in wages, a reduction of hours, or relief from any other grievance. The judge shall be authorized by statute to consider impartially every appeal, shall be empowered to summon witnesses, and call for any evidence desired. The decision of the court shall be binding on both sides and be effective from the day of the petition, but either side has the right to appeal to the next higher court, whose decision in the matter shall be final. Refusal by an employee to obey the court's decision will result in the forfeiture of his work card, whereas an employer's non-compliance will be punished by debarring him from continuation in business. Such are the essential features of the plan that is intended to put an end to the turmoil caused by industrial unrest. The question still remains whether the workers of the country will submit to this paternalistic scheme for regulating their lives and incomes. Undoubtedly the proposal will have the support of the business interests of the country, who have nothing to lose by this measure and everything to gain. What chance the workers will have of securing their demands can be seen from the fact that the judges of Japan are appointed by the Government and the industrial masses are disenfranchised by a property qualification under which only fifteen per cent of the adult male population may vote.

The industrial situation becomes even more complicated when it is realized that Japan's great asset in international industrial competition is its abundance of cheap labor. If its workers can secure wages approximating those paid to British, French, German, or even American labor, Japan will lose most of the markets captured during the war.

The Labor Church in Canada

By W. IRVINE

IN this period of general readjustment it is, of course, natural and inevitable that the church, or institutionalized religion, should be called upon to square itself with the need for human service or go out of existence.

In Canada, and presumably in most other countries, the church is among the most backward of all institutions. It would be superfluous to review here the long years of decadence. The failing power of churchianity is due to the growing conviction that the church is a class institution, depending for its existence not on truth, but on preaching the gospel of those with financial power. In gaining the purse-strings of the rich, it lost the confidence of the masses, and in Canada today it can be reckoned with only as a reactionary factor.

The Great War had its effect upon the church as definitely as upon trade or national debt. Up to the moment that war was declared the clergy had been the professed champions of peace; they had held up for emulation the "meek" and "lowly" Jesus; they told us to love our enemies, to bless those who cursed us, and pray for them that despitefully used us or persecuted us; and above all we were to overcome evil with good. This was a profitable doctrine during an industrial struggle between the workers and the masters, but presto! the Gospel changed over night when Germany declared war. Forthwith every sanctuary became a recruiting office and the convener of the Presbyterian Assembly appeared with his sword at his belt.

No one denies the church, or any other institution, the right to change its view if this is done in sincerity and in an honest search for truth. But why does the church go back to the old Gospel as soon as the war is over? This is the action which has completely destroyed public confidence. No sooner was peace declared than the wage earners, and many returned soldiers, decided to take "direct action" in securing industrial amelioration: the One Big Union was born and became portentous. At that moment the church abandons its war philosophy, quickly strips the armor from the fighting Saviour, and presents him once more as the meek and lowly Carpenter who said: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's."

These conditions have helped greatly to further a new religious movement in Canada. The people have been able in their reflection upon current events to discern between the essential principles of truth and an outworn institution; between churchianity and Christianity. Men of vision and courage have also appeared with ability to organize and lead, and are undertaking the task of creating new institutions capable of containing the new spirit of the eternal Christ incarnate in humanity. New churches are springing up everywhere under the leadership of men like the Rev. J. S. Woodsworth, the Rev. S. G. Bland, the Rev. A. E. Smith, and the Rev. W. Ivens. These men have for many years been persecuted by church boards and wealthy directors, because of their fearless proclamation of fundamental principles. Dr. Bland, who for many years had been the most respected professor of Wesley College, Winnipeg, was discharged by the wealthy directors because of his views on social justice; Ivens was squeezed out on account of his war views; Woodsworth and Smith, after years of discour-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agement, left the church in disgust. These men, and many others like them, are accepting the leadership in a religion for the new age.

From Fort William to Vancouver, in every large center, agencies called in some instances the "Labor Church"; in others the "People's Church," and again named the "People's University," have sprung up spontaneously. These organizations, whatever name they may adopt, afford a meeting-place for all who are conscious of the need for fellowship in a vital religion, stripped of its medieval dogmatism and fantastic other-worldism; they stand for an unhampered search for and declaration of truth; and they are organized entities endeavoring to establish the brotherhood of man in modern society. There are eight of these new churches in Winnipeg, Manitoba; one in Fort William, Ontario; one in Brandon, Manitoba; one in Calgary, Alberta; one in Edmonton, Alberta; one in Victoria, British Columbia, and one in Vancouver, British Columbia. All this development has taken place in less than one year.

So far there has been no attempt to unify the various bodies organized. But, in looking over the declared aims of these different organizations, one is struck with the general tendency to place the chief emphasis upon humanity, and on the setting forth of a definite program of good to be obtained in the present world. It is likely that a conference will be held at which the new faith will be definitely announced and at which organized efforts for its propagation will be undertaken.

The basis of membership in this new church does not rest upon a belief in a theological syllogism. "Any one," it is declared, "shall be eligible for membership who believes in the need for and possibility of a better day for human society, and who is willing to make some systematic, consistent, and constructive contribution of thought, time, influence, and means toward that end."

The organizations above mentioned are the spontaneous development of a religion which will serve our age. The churches of today have the challenge to serve or die. While the Canadian churches are blind to the real need of the hour, they are not unaware of the danger to themselves. In an effort to regain the respect of the people, several denominations have joined in what has been called a "Forward Movement." The chief feature of this attempt has been the raising of 11 millions of dollars. Clergymen have admitted to the writer that this so-called forward movement of the churches was initiated and financed by the Big Interests. No doubt the leaders of thought in the church are working toward a different end, but, having received 11 million dollars in advance, and having wealthy people in most of the executive positions in the church, it is more than likely that the pulpit will use its influence against the real forward movement, and preach the continuation of things as they are.

Meanwhile the new church, with a new religion and a new appeal, gathers strength to do service for a new day. The religion that is going to count for something in the future progress of the world is that which is coming out of the heart of the common people. It is the spirit of every revolt against oppression, injustice, and inhumanity.

If religion could have been confined to the churches, it would long since have died. But during the last generation or so religion has been undergoing open-air treatment, and now gives promise of becoming healthy and sufficiently robust to put its hands on what is the matter with the world.

Prelude to a Pantomime

By GUSTAV DAVIDSON

Though there is brown in the west
I have a sense of the silver
Of quickening feet,
Asteria;
Silver of thy beautiful bare feet,
Asteria.

Art thou cold in thy veils,
In thy thin veils,
My beloved?
Soon,
With that splendid passion of thine,
Thou wilt cast them to the ground,
Impatient even of their hindrance when thou dancest before me,
Asteria;
When thou dancest before me the Dance of the Nine Jewels,
My beloved.

It is quiet now
As always
At the setting of the sun.

Ay, dost thou start at that trill?
It is only the nightingale
In some hard-by grove
Remembering her ancient pain.

. . . Well, are thy golden anklets set firm,
Are all the nine jewels in thy hair?

Here on the grass
As thou dancest before me,
Asteria,
I shall sit and watch thee:
I know of a breeze that comes this hour from Cephisis
Laden with the odor of thyme:
It will blow into thy mouth the fragrance of ripe bergamot—
Into thy sweet mouth as thou dancest before me,
Asteria,
At the setting of the sun.

I think,
My beloved,
That thus thou wilt seem more lovely than Aganippe
Of the sacred fountains:
Thine anointed hands will gleam like studded swords
Crossed in the firelight;
Thy beautiful bare feet will flash whiter than Daphne's in flight;
Like burnished shields held to the night stars,
So will thy warm breasts glisten.
Surely I will crave none other than thee,
Asteria,
For thou wilt be desireful tonight above all women in Ilium!

There is purple and gold in the west,
My beloved,
And already I have a sense of the silver
Of quickening feet,
Asteria.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communism in the Ruhr

By WILLIAM MacDONALD

Düsseldorf, April 10

I STARTED for the region of the Ruhr with certain prepossessions which, in view of all the circumstances, could hardly, perhaps, have been avoided. The German newspapers which I was able to get at Paris—and German newspapers, I may remark in passing, are on sale at news stalls all over Paris—pictured the Communist outbreak in the Ruhr Valley as an organized and widespread rebellion against all governmental authority as well as against law and order in general, attended with plundering and outrage, and requiring the use of some thousands of the Reichswehr troops to suppress the armed forces which were ravaging the country. There were reports of ruthless killings, of pitched battles between Communists and Reichswehr, of a general strike at Essen and elsewhere which was paralyzing industry and in particular stopping the production of coal, and of the near approach of starvation due to the suspension of railway traffic. A British officer at Cologne said that he thought it would be safe enough for me to go in, but that I was liable to be arrested and would do well to be ready to leave in a hurry; moreover, some food in my luggage would be an advantage. The German consul at Cologne, who visaed my passport, expressed surprise that I should wish to go where machine guns and aeroplanes were actively at work. The qualifying argument to all this was the controversy which was going on between the German and French Governments regarding the necessity of sending German troops into the occupied zone in order to suppress the rebellion; which seemed to suggest that the trouble might not be so serious as the German press, and the Paris press—which as a whole said the same thing as the German press—represented; but I was in the Ruhr and seeing the situation for myself when the French occupied Frankfort.

My immediate objective was Essen, where the Reichswehr was reported to be in possession of the center of the city and the Krupp works and neighborhood, but where plundering and street fighting were said to be going on in other parts of the town. When I left Cologne, passenger trains were running only as far as Düsseldorf. A few citizen guards, armed with rifles, were walking about the streets of Düsseldorf, and numerous posters called upon all persons to obey the constituted authorities of the city and gave warning that robbers and plunderers would be summarily dealt with. For the rest, the city seemed to be pursuing its usual course of life. There being no trains beyond Düsseldorf, I took an electric tram to Duisburg. The tram was packed to suffocation with passengers and luggage, and consumed two and a half hours in covering the twenty-five kilometers between the two cities. The Reichswehr, whose advance guard had entered Duisburg two days before, had surrounded the approaches to the Rathaus with barbed-wire barricades, parked a few machine guns and armored motor cars in the open space in front of the building, and were lazily patrolling one or two of the principal streets. The only signs, however, of the rioting and disorder, which were reported to have run wild in the city were a few broken panes of glass in some shop windows. The streets were alive with people, and the cafés were crowded. I took another electric tram for Mülheim, hoping to get to Essen in that way. Mülheim, however, was still the apparent center of the Communist operations, and the tram ran only to the outskirts of the town. I walked on a short distance, but was stopped by a guard when I reached the limit of the Reichswehr sphere of influence, and was unable to persuade the guard that I ought, even as an American, to be allowed to proceed. So I returned to Duisburg, and had coffee with the rest of the population.

Not being able to enter Essen from the west, I decided to try an approach from the east. Passenger service beyond Düsseldorf to the east having been in part restored, I spent the next two or three days in going up and down the Ruhr Valley, visiting Elberfeld, Barmen, Hagen, and Dortmund, all of them centers of the Communist movement. Nowhere were there signs of recent disorder. The great manufacturing and mining region was a hive of industry, retail business was going on as usual, and food was readily obtainable. There were the usual posters announcing that order had been restored, and calling upon all persons who had arms to surrender them to the proper authorities. Men with whom I talked were inclined to speak lightly of the "war" as an unimportant affair now happily over, although few seemed enthusiastic over the presence, real or prospective, of the Reichswehr. The Communist forces, apparently, had fled or quietly melted away. It was difficult to believe that I was mingling with people who, only a few days before, had been in terror of their lives, or who had been plundered and abused by a Bolshevist horde, or who were rejoicing in a great deliverance. "Business as usual" was the legend written plainly across the face of every one of the communities which I visited.

I went into Essen on the first train that entered that city from the east. Here, at last, I was in the center of the dying revolution. The Reichswehr forces had only just established their authority there, and armed soldiers were fairly numerous about the streets. There were guards at the railway station, about the Rathaus, and in front of some of the banks, and passersby were sharply ordered to keep moving. In the course of two or three hours' walk about the city I saw numerous prisoners being marched to the Rathaus or elsewhere under military escort; two alleged Communists had only a few hours before been shot after summary trial, and the air was full of rumors of other executions, as to the truth of which I could obtain no certain confirmation. It was clear that Essen was experiencing some of the rigors of military government—rigors the more threatening because the military government was rapidly becoming irresponsible save to itself. The arrest of two English correspondents, one of whom was beaten by the soldiers, brought a protest in Berlin which the Reichswehr leaders were compelled to heed; but an American correspondent who had been in Essen during the earlier days of the trouble had to explain himself to the military authorities, and spies in the hotels saw to it that the movements of foreigners were duly reported.

An adequate discussion of the significance of the outbreak in the Ruhr would require extended consideration of the political situation in Germany, and particularly at Berlin. As usual, also, the testimony of eye-witnesses is conflicting. Certain things, however, seem clear. The Communist rising in the Ruhr was a premature and ill-planned affair, doomed to failure from the start. Like radical proletarians the world over, the leaders of the enterprise were more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effective in talk than they were in action. They had no treasury with which to maintain an army, and no evident ability with which to conduct a government; while from the bulk of the working population there appeared only apathy or more or less pronounced opposition. One may hesitate to affirm that the movement would have failed completely if the Government at Berlin had not interfered by force, but it is at least hard to see how the movement could have succeeded.

While the revolution lasted, however, it was conducted with singular moderation. I am constrained to believe that the accounts which the German newspapers gave from day to day of what went on were in large measure a fabric of untruths, more or less deliberately concocted for the sake of political effect. The Communist army hardly exceeded 10,000 men at the most, most of them young men and boys. There was no plundering, looting, or general disorder worth dwelling upon. Save for a two or three days' strike at Essen, industry, including mining of coal, went on pretty much as usual; freight trains were operated when passenger trains were not, and while there was some shortage of food, there was no real danger of starvation. The reports of huge injuries to property appear to be pure fabrications, and Duisburg seems to be the only place at which money was forcibly taken from the banks. One need hold no brief for ordinary revolutionary tactics to aver that the Ruhr rebellion would have gone further and been more successful if those who directed it had not been so orderly and considerate in the treatment of those against whom they for a time waged open war.

For the conduct of the Berlin Government there must be, on the whole, only strong condemnation. French and British authorities at Mayence and Cologne were well aware of the weakness of the Communist movement and of its probable early collapse; and they knew well, as did the Government at Berlin, that there was no need of sending the Reichswehr into the occupied territory in order to deal with the trouble. The action of the Berlin Government in sending troops into the neutral zone was a deliberate provocation to Allied action, and gave the French the opportunity which they desired to proceed with their plan of crushing Germany. Back of the whole action of the Berlin Government, in other words, lay the monarchist movement of which the Kapp episode was the ill-timed beginning, and which threatens to sweep Germany into a sea of trouble and anarchy the limits of which no one can now trace. Plainly inspired statements in the German newspapers during the past few days confirm the suspicion that the Reichswehr is more and more feeling its power, and that as authority and political character at Berlin decline the army will more and more assume the familiar role of dictator. What this means for the German proletariat in general, and for the industrial population of the Ruhr in particular, is of course not wholly plain.

The deadly apathy of the German middle class, and its dull reluctance to taking up the burdensome task of self-government, make it at the moment an easy prey to militarism. The only hope for the working class, on the other hand, seems to lie in the perfecting of their international organization. If this is the course which the labor and revolutionary movements are to take, it may be that the next protest against militarism and imperialism will appear, not in a revival of Communism in the industrial cities of the Ruhr, but revolutionary outbreaks in Italy or France.

The Victory of German Democracy*

By THEODOR WOLFF

Berlin, March 25

A VICTORY was gained by the German democracy on March 18 the significance of which can perhaps only be understood by those who have been in touch with events. The *Putsch*, which surprised Berlin, was made by men who, though only political adventurers, were men with nerves of steel, iron will, and devoid of consideration. They came, not with a handful of untrained men, but with picked troops of the *Reichswehr*. They commanded about 9,000 men, magnificently trained and armed, and led by the most resolute members of the old reactionary Officers' Corps, who were joined on the first day by officers of the old army, and German-National Students. On the other hand, the troops left for the protection of Berlin, belonging to the *Reichswehr* and *Sicherheitswehr*, were untrustworthy, at best remained neutral and stayed in barracks, or went over immediately to the raiders.

In this unprecedented situation, all democratic and republican circles, and all those who realized the criminal lunacy of the *Putsch*, showed admirable courage and firmness. Whether it was right that the Government should go out of Berlin in the night, as the rebels entered, is a matter of opinion. They did not flee from cowardice, but because they wished to retain their freedom of action. All high officials, all Under-Secretaries of State, refused to serve the new masters. Leaders of the three Government parties, the German Democratic Party, the Social Democrats, and the Centrist Party, foregathered immediately and called a general strike. The Independents joined, and the Government issued an appeal from Dresden to all workers, employees, and officials to cease work. Twenty-four hours after the entry of the Pretorians, the defense was organized. Nearly every man did his duty as a matter of course, and General von Lüttwitz's announcement that incitement to a general strike would be punished by death was met with a laugh.

Strategists of the counter-revolution have never so miscalculated. There was always a possibility that a military *coup* might succeed at the outset, but to every sober observer it seemed extremely unlikely that such a success would last or could overthrow the Republic. The wish of the vast majority was that Germany should suffer no more upheavals; that through peaceful work she should redeem her position and enter once more into relations with the still hostile foreign nations. Only under a democratic regime was all this possible. This vast majority believed it had seen the first faint signs of a friendlier feeling in England, America, and Italy, and although sensible views had been checked by French nationalism, it was full of hope. The desire to work was growing, coal production was rising, the ultra-Radical agitators were finding more difficulty in obtaining a hearing among the workers. How was it possible for the great mass of citizens and workers to welcome a band of raiders whose criminal action was plunging the country into fresh and boundless confusion that could only aid Germany's bitterest enemies?

* This is the first of several projected letters arranged for jointly with the London *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The very worst type of the Junker caste and bankrupt militarists entered Berlin at the head of the rebel troops. Besides Herr Kapp, who, during the war, was continually hatching plots against Bethmann-Hollweg, and all who really wanted peace, came Herr von Jagow, the former President of Police in Berlin, who had had workers cut down by the sword when they demanded equal suffrage. Still more unsympathetic was Colonel Bauer, Ludendorff's right hand at Great Headquarters. Ludendorff himself stood behind Bauer with advice, and encouraged General von Lüttwitz when he began to weaken.

March 18, when the troops of the Reactionaries had to leave Berlin and the Reign of Force was ended, remains a day of triumph for the German people, in spite of all the pitiful bloodshed and of the many dead lying by the wayside. With the authors and leaders of this crime, the parties of the Right are defeated. They had believed that in the coming elections votes would stream in for them. Now they are compromised, boundlessly unpopular, and detested. The more intelligent among them had condemned the *Putsch;* but the parties as a whole, the German-National Party and the German People's Party, so long as it seemed successful, disowned it half-heartedly or supported it.

The union organizations of workers, employees, and officials called off the general strike only after the leaders of the majority parties and the Ministry had accepted certain conditions. Nearly all these conditions tally with the desires of the other democratic parties. We are all agreed that the authors and leaders of the *Putsch* must be severely punished. While General Lüttwitz and his Pretorians still dominated Berlin, it was unanimously decided at a committee meeting of the German Democratic Party that there was to be no talk of an amnesty. The criminals have fled, but they are being pursued. In all probability the confiscation of their fortunes will be made law. The removal from office of the few officials who placed themselves at the service of the reactionary government, was an obvious necessity; they were dismissed yesterday. As obvious and necessary was the disbanding of the military units of the counter-revolution and the dismissal of their officers. Again, it was impossible that Noske should remain. Noske saved Berlin in January and in March, 1919. But he allowed himself to be intimidated by his military colleagues, heeded no warning, and guarded Berlin inefficiently. Although his friends among the Socialists would gladly have retained him, it was impossible. The Prussian Minister of the Interior, Wolfgang Heine, also had to go.

Among the decisions that led to the ending of the general strike are some that bear on socialization and economic reform; and some which assure influence to the Trade Unions in the reconstruction of the Government. The Trade Unions represent a minority in the country, and it is somewhat contradictory to the principle of democracy to allow them a special privilege when filling ministerial posts. Nor is it quite justifiable for them to say that the workers alone gained the victory and drove the raiders away. Other sections of the people helped at least as much to drive out the tyrants and ran a greater danger. Hitherto many a worthy Trade Union official in the Government has lacked the necessary knowledge and experience as well as capacity for government. Clinging to incapable and unimportant ministers, who find favor with neither bourgeoisie or independents, may weaken the impression of a democratic victory. Minister of National Economy Schmidt lacks, with the exception of honesty and industry, qualifications to find a way out of the present terrible economic distress. The Social Democrats refuse to give him up, also Herman Müller who, with honest endeavor but without any previous knowledge, officiates as Minister of Foreign Affairs. Reconstruction Minister Gessler is mentioned as Noske's successor. Gessler, who was formerly Chief Burgomaster of Nuremberg, is a clever, charming man, but whether he is the man to bring order into the *Reichswehr* is doubtful.

The act of violence perpetrated by the Reactionaries has naturally reawakened Radicalism with its extreme demands, passions, and Utopias. When we called a general strike we knew that the Radical elements would use it to their advantage. But nothing else was left for us to do. Even had the order not been given—and how was it to be avoided?—the leaning toward Bolshevism would have gained fresh impetus. For the workman whom Noske has disappointed is easily persuaded that only complete social transformation will protect him from the detested sword.

Unrest continues in many places, excitement still runs high. Berlin is nervous in the extreme. The same people who strode about unafraid among flying bullets, have allowed themselves to be influenced by false rumors. One said the Baltic troops, who fought constant and bloody battles with the public, were returning, another that the Reds were marching against Berlin. As no news was obtainable, the people were inclined to give credence to untruths. Now that most of the wage demands have been regulated, work is to begin again. The Independents, too, have decided to call off the strike. In spite of this there are still many groups of workers who make fresh demands. The town gas works are still idle. Many machines have been damaged, and the situation remains critical. But we hope that the pendulum which before the *Putsch* swung to the Right and now swings to the Left, will gradually find its halting place where democracy stands.

Why Freedom Disappears

By WILL DURANT

IN a sense, freedom in politics and speech is an unusual condition, the protege of forces which operate sporadically and transiently, and therefore a frequent casualty in the course of historical development. Voltaire and Montesquieu were amazed at the freedom of speech, press, and worship which they found in England. They came from a country in which the power of the king was absolute, to a country whose king had been reduced, by an alliance of merchants and nobles, to an ornamental symbol of imperial unity and a convenient instrument of national hypnotism. Returning to France, they spent a wealth of superlatives on English freedom. "How I love the boldness of the English!" exclaimed Voltaire; "how I admire men who say what they think!" "England is at this moment," said Montesquieu, "possessed of more freedom than any other nation in the world." Yet in this same England, toward the end of that same eighteenth century, freedom of speech was destroyed almost to the roots. Thomas Paine was prosecuted for printing "The Rights of Man"; the issue was confiscated; wherever two or three men gathered together to discuss the French Revolution spies were present; a minister of the gospel was sent to jail for fourteen years for saying that he sympathized with the Revolution; in Edinburgh anybody

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suspected of liberal ideas was arrested and sentenced, irrespective of law. "Send me the prisoners and I will find the law," said one of the judges. Radicals were deported to Botany Bay for periods up to sixteen years; Coleridge, Southey, and Wordsworth were cowed into retractions.

Now why had freedom disappeared? Largely because the security of the government had disappeared, threatened by the international overflow of the revolutionary spirit. It is a hobby of all governments, as of all individuals, that they relish their own permanence; and when they are in danger they do not handicap themselves with moral scruples or legal technicalities. Freedom is a luxury which comes only when governments are very powerful, or when they are very weak.

This first factor in freedom—the security of the existing political structure—has been combined, in England and America, with geographical immunity from international disturbance. In the latter country other factors have had a special prominence. There was, first in importance, free land. When a man might have an acre for squatting on it, and undeveloped communication made almost every farm an economic sovereignty, life was so free that liberty was not discussed. Men had personality, because they owned their tools of production and controlled the conditions under which they worked. It was men whose independence of character and freedom of behavior were thus rooted in the soil they tilled that put into the Presidential chair the founder of the Democratic party, the great antagonist of the Alien and Sedition acts, the man who said that a government that could not be criticized was a government that could not be trusted. And it was out of these conditions that there developed not only the American tradition of liberty, but the American type of character, which, at least when depicted by Americans, specializes in vigorous independence of thought and action. It was out of this background that there emerged the men of initiative, courage, and enterprise who supplied America with its famous captains of industry; and on the other side it was among men so nurtured that the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor found members sturdy enough to fight with some success the most powerful industrial combinations which history has ever seen. These latter men, for the most part, were skilled laborers; and as such they had in them the pride which props up personality and makes for freedom. And even for unskilled labor, in those days, "free contract" had some freedom in it, for the dissatisfied worker could ground his tools and go off to the unexhausted land of the West. Finally, open competition was the rule of the industrial game in almost every phase. And where competition is open, freedom flourishes.

All these conditions have passed away. Security of political structure is gone, isolation is gone, free land is gone, free competition is gone, individual ownership of the tools of production is gone, and soon skilled labor will be gone too. The farmer has lost his independence, and begins to feel the vise in which the middleman is squeezing him. The editor who owns his newspaper and expresses his own views is a vestigial remnant now, when a thousand sheets tell the same lie in the same way on the same day, for various rewards. The large-scale monopoly has swallowed up the captain of industry; and even the employer of hundreds knows that he is at the mercy of financiers. The shopkeeper is in the toils of the distributers; the clerks become the proletariat of the pen, the teachers desert to the factories, and the whole lower middle class is being submerged in the rising costs of existence.

But the basic fact in the situation is the rapid disappearance of the man who owned his own tools and controlled the conditions of his own work. Freedom cannot long survive in a system in which an ever decreasing proportion of men control access to the means of production for an ever increasing proportion of producers. Freedom stands on personality; and personality is bound up with control of the conditions of one's work, so that one may express himself in his product. This sense of personality has decayed throughout the last one hundred years because ever more and more men have lost the ownership of their tools and the control over their own working conditions. The last stage in the process is the displacement of their painfully-acquired skill.

Where there is skill, there personality and independence survive despite the handicap of other conditions. To have special ability, to show some exceptional quality in workmanship, stamps one with character, and makes one stand out as human in a welter of mechanical routine. Such a man does not lend himself readily to indoctrination and unquestioning subordination. The unskilled worker is more docile. The soul starves on routine, and repetition dulls the edge of thought; so that at last the worker is almost as mechanical as his machine. Hence, the ideal of the business man is now a wage-labor force which shall consist entirely of unskilled workers. To this end inventors improve machinery; and "scientific" management, by time-and-motion study, breaks up the processes of skill into components which in severalty can be taught to the dullest soul. The personnel of the American factory tends ever more and more toward the impersonal. This was made clear long since by Professor Hoxie and Carleton Parker.

Now, to men so reduced to mechanism, liberty is a meaningless word. As America fills up, year by year, with men made brutal by such routine, or men deliberately imported because already dulled by foreign circumstance, the very bottom falls out of the American tradition of liberty. For liberty as a political concept has no vitality where there is no liberty in economic life. We cannot make a nation of Jeffersons out of a slum of slaves. We must change the current of our industrial development, or we must stop our talk about political liberty.

This, then, is why freedom disappears from American politics—simply because it has disappeared from American economic life. Our industrial leaders are knowingly filling their factories with men capable of violence but not of freedom. We are passing back from contract to status, from interfluent classes to closed castes; and where caste and status delimit life, liberty is the prerogative of a clique rather than the possession of a nation. The slave-drivers are determined to destroy even the forms of liberty; for they have set their eyes on the Egyptian model, and they feel that the processes even of political liberty will be a disintegrating force in the structure which they propose to build. There will be no need for freedom in a world in which a few men will undertake to decide everything.

In short, a small number of powerful and cultureless men are bringing about, by violence and bloodshed and illegality of every kind, a revolution in America: the rapid replacement of our nineteenth-century structure of freedom of work, thought, and speech by a system in which a handful of men with open brutality rule millions of men reduced to open slavery. For this end, labor organizations

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be broken, whether by provoking strikes when the workers are weak and the company is ahead with its orders, or by using the military power of the government to enforce submission to reduced standards of life. For this end, all sincere political opposition must be eliminated, even if the Constitution must, for this purpose, be overridden and broken into fragments. The only parties who may share in the game of legislation must be those who accept the situation with grace, and promise their cooperation to maintain it. And if any man, agitated by some sentimental preference for "our ancient liberties," or other nonsense of that kind, should endeavor to arouse his fellows to the reality that is growing up about them and upon them, he will find every newspaper in the land proving to a docile public that he is disloyal to the government, and is advocating the nationalization of women.

H. G. Wells and the War

By DOUGLAS GOLDRING

AMONG the leaders of Democratic thought in England during the past twenty-five years no individual has been more prominent, more justly acclaimed, than Mr. H. G. Wells. Perhaps no writer, with the possible exception of Bernard Shaw, has exerted a more profound and widespread influence on the minds of the younger generation of English men and women. The debt which all thinking people in this country owe to Mr. Wells is so great that, regardless of his war record, whatever it may be, nobody with a spark of generosity in his composition can fail to acknowledge it with gratitude. But there are dangers in allowing this gratitude to enslave our intelligence. The question must be asked by the international-minded at this juncture whether Mr. Wells is for us or against us. And if he should declare himself on our side, we have to ask ourselves further whether we can trust him any longer.

During the war Mr. Wells occupied a special, an almost unique position. Unlike Mr. Shaw, who has, like the prophets, always made a practice of saying five years in advance what the generality of intelligent people will eventually accept as the truth, Mr. Wells has interpreted the best thought current in England at particular moments in a manner capable of immediate acceptance by large sections of our population. Thus during the past five years he might, in a very intimate sense, have become our national spokesman. He might have crystallized, more effectively even than President Wilson, the vague hopes and desires of decent "plain people." He needed but courage in order to reveal to innumerable simple souls what they really, at the bottom of their hearts, thought and felt. Throughout his career he has been a voluminous publicist. He is a Republican, for a time he was one of the shining lights of the Fabian Society. That conflict between capital and labor, the existence of which the collapse of the enemy has now laid bare even to the densest minds among us, has occupied his attention for years. And before August, 1914, for at least a decade, young men and women in this country had imbibed from Mr. Wells hatred of war, distrust of that capitalism which is the chief underlying cause of war, distrust of monarchy, imperialism, British educational methods, politicians, and our higher bourgeoisie. No writer had done more than Mr. Wells to encourage the growing tendency toward iconoclasm, toward breaking up as a prelude to rebuilding. The seeds of those new ideas which are now everywhere gaining acceptance, were widely sown by him in pre-war England. His novel "The World Set Free," in which in the spring of 1914 he foretold the World War, must have given the first push to the young men and women who, when the war actually broke out, formed the backbone of the International Socialist party in England. By awakening the consciences of large numbers of his readers on the subject of mutual murder and capitalist exploitation, he did more than any other Englishman to produce that essentially English product, the "Conscientious Objector."

When war broke out, while many of Mr. Wells's disciples were keeping alight the flame of those principles which with such eloquence he had instilled into their minds, Mr. Wells himself, like the majority of us, completely lost his head. At one moment he was urging all the middle-aged gentlemen living in the country to clean their rook-rifles so that, when the Hun invaded, they might lurk behind hedges and bag at least a victim apiece before their women were raped —regardless of the fact that, according to those laws of warfare which we observed so faithfully in South Africa, such a proceeding would have justified the Germans in burning every village they entered. This emotional episode, in giving us the clue to Mr. Wells's character, at the same time makes any bitterness we might be tempted to feel toward him unjustifiable, and it also shows us how completely, as an intellectual leader, he is untrustworthy. For Mr. Wells is a man of genius with a temperament; and allowances must be made for his temperament. He has not, one suspects, the moral and intellectual courage of a Bertrand Russell or a Bernard Shaw, because he does not possess their self-control. He is not one whom we could reasonably expect to die like Giordano Bruno, or even to put himself within reach of Dora. His finest qualities are his sensitiveness to ideas, his eager scanning of the future, his belief in and love for humanity, the wide range of his imagination, and his ability—at his best moments—to combine emotional warmth with a scientific clarity. The value of his political writings has lain always in their suggestiveness. He has the knack of starting trains of thought in his readers' minds. What it is that he is suggesting perhaps very often he does not himself realize, and would endeavor to counteract if he did. He does not deliver a gospel; he pours out the raw material for several contradictory gospels. It is for those who read him to select from his work what is of value to them and resolutely to reject the rest.

If the war has not displayed Mr. Wells in the light of a hero, it has at least revealed him as an honest and lovable human being, intensely emotional, compounded of wisdom and folly, of faults and virtues like the rest of us, but with, on the whole, a bias toward such things as are decent, humane, and democratic.

His war books reflected current opinion, but did not form it. "Mr. Britling Sees it Through" was a brilliant exposition of that first awakening from intellectual numbness which took place in England after the first year of the war. The book did not bring about this awakening, it recorded it. It was published at precisely the right moment and was an immense success. "The Soul of a Bishop," which followed it, reflected in an eminently prudent manner that half-wistful reexamination of the Sermon on the Mount which was taking place in the minds of religious people during the period just preceding the Lloyd George-Northcliffe intrigue, when peace was a possibility. The point of the book was so

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carefully wrapped up that the majority of Mr. Wells's library subscribers and none, apparently, of his reviewers were able to perceive it. But it was there. The book interpreted what was in the minds of a number of inarticulate people whose religious feeling was leading them toward a demand for peace.

With the arrival of Mr. Lloyd George's "knock-out" coalition of politician and pressmen, there came a fresh and more violent inundation of "hate" journalism. The tired passions of the mob were violently whipped up. A return to the War Spirit was preached in the columns of the great newspapers, and the people responded. Victory was in sight! One more effort! Another million men! Even transcendental pacifism now meant danger for a popular author. The award for plain speaking and clear thinking was jail, exile, or, at least, financial loss. And never was there a period when the purveyors of higher thought occupied themselves more desperately with the safety and comfort of the higher thinker.

Mr. Wells might at this time have done something to stop the rot, had he possessed the qualities essential in a leader. Not possessing these qualities, he once again acted as a "reflector." He crystallized the idea of the mob, but he crystallized (and it is due to him to say it) not their worst ideas but their best. How bad these were can be seen by anyone who cares to study "Joan and Peter." Perhaps Mr. Wells himself was uneasy and dissatisfied, because this portentously long and jaded novel marked the lowest intellectual level which he had yet touched. He had fled from the task of educating the people about the one subject which was agitating their minds. The darkness of war brooding over the whole land was only made darker by him. His pages contained no light in the sense in which readers of Henri Barbusse understand that word. "Joan and Peter" merely reflected the misery and bewilderment which afflicted the crowd. Amid the horror and desolation caused by a bankrupt social system, at the end of a world period, when our civilization seemed to be breaking itself to pieces on the battlefields of Europe, Mr. Wells consecrated his enormous novel to enshrining and amplifying this profound conclusion: "a world whose schools are unreformed is an unreformed world!" Joan and Peter are only typical public-school boy, typical public-school girl. Mr. Wells seems to have discovered the "English gentleman" at the very moment when the more clear-sighted of his compatriots were beginning to find him out. Peter can neither reject nor rebel, and except for the fact that he is a rather more lamentable prig than the average boy unhampered by an Empire-building guardian with a sense of mission, he belongs precisely to the type which the English public schools have for generations turned out in tens of thousands. An England of Peters will remain an unreformed England. Joan is a more likable and slightly less stereotyped figure than Peter, but as a product of educational reform she is pathetic. As the heroine of a *feuilleton* called "The Soul of a Wack" she would be perfect. One can imagine her (she is a chauffeur in the Wacks) driving General Dyer to his Amritsar *battue* with ecstasy. One cannot imagine her, in an access of rebellious rage, driving General Dyer into the ditch. But unless educational reform in England is going to turn English boys and girls into rational human beings capable of generous indignation, incapable of mean and sentimental acquiescence, it will not save us, and it will not be reform.

It is a relief to turn from the Mr. Wells of the last stages of the war to another Mr. Wells, the author of passages such as this: "At first I was extraordinarily excited by my baptism of fire. Then as the heat of the day came on I experienced an enormous tedium and discomfort. . . . I kept thinking of the dead Prussian down among the corn and of the bitter outcries of my own man. Damned foolery! It *was* damned foolery. But who was to blame? How had we got to this? . . . .

" 'From Holland to the Alps this day,' I thought, 'there must be crouching and lying between half and a million of men, trying to inflict irreparable damage upon one another. The thing is idiotic to the pitch of impossibility. It is a dream. Presently I shall wake up' . . .

"Then the phrase changed itself in my mind. 'Presently mankind will wake up.'

"I lay speculating just how many thousands of men there were among these hundreds of thousands, whose spirits were in rebellion against all these ancient traditions of flag and empire. Wern't we perhaps already in the throes of the last crisis, in that darkest moment of a nightmare's horror before the sleeper will endure no more of it—and wakes?"

Mr. Wells has been talking to returned soldiers, you think, and I have stolen into his study and transcribed some lines from the manuscript of his forthcoming novel. Not a bit of it. The passage I have quoted was published in the spring of 1914. In the ghastly intervening years many millions of people have "woken up" from their nightmare. The questions postulated by the war have been answered by a great cry of rebellion from millions of human hearts. And Mr. Wells, who had the imagination to foretell both questions and answers, has Mr. Wells gone to sleep? If he has, mindful of his many services to humanity, perhaps the least we can do is to leave him undisturbed. When he wakes again he will see the forces he once led, far in front of him, rushing to attack. And he will have all his work cut out if he wishes to catch them up. If, panting after them, he cries: "Stop! Stop—I am one of your leaders," it is to be hoped that they will not delay their advance to listen. For, unlike the warfare of guns and tanks, the warfare of ideas cannot be conducted from the rear.

Contributors to This Issue

IDA O'NEIL is assistant professor of Romance languages in the Western Reserve University.

HIRAM K. MODERWELL is an American journalist, at present in Italy.

MILES M. SHEROWER is connected with the *Trans-Pacific* of Yokohama.

W. IRVINE, formerly pastor of the Unitarian church of Calgary, Canada, is now doing educational work in connection with the United Farmers of Alberta.

THEODOR WOLFF, one of the foremost liberal journalists in Germany, is editor of the Berlin *Tageblatt*.

WILL DURANT, writer and lecturer, is the author of "Philosophy and the Social Problem."

DOUGLAS GOLDRING is a young English novelist.

VAN WYCK BROOKS is with the editorial staff of the *Freeman*.

The other contributors are well-known to *Nation* readers through previous articles.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Driftway

THE Drifter cannot become greatly excited about the drift toward overalls. He has seen enthusiasms for economy before and has nearly always seen them turn out expensive. What he guesses will happen now is something like this: Overalls, of all hues and persuasions, will rise in price so much that they will become a burden to the large part of the population, farmers and mechanics, who at present regularly wear them but who will then have to fall back on their Sunday suits and make them do for everyday. The rich will trifle for a few weeks with overalls, but they will not be satisfied with the accepted contours of those garments and will instead set the better tailors to driving needles easily through denim—for a consideration. After a few weeks the middle order of men will find that no overalls charm the middle order of women unless custom-made. They will then either sink their money into such luxuries or else forego the novel raiment altogether. By this time the rich will have tired of their toys and will have laid them away in the ancestral attic to be found later and wondered at by juvenile antiquarians. Meanwhile the temporary slack in the sale of woolen clothing will have been made up for by the sale of overalls to the impetuous. Net result—a million or so superfluous suits of overalls and hardly a woolen suit less. If the Drifter were of a suspicious nature he would sniff something in the woodpile, say, a plan on the part of the overall-makers, for once gaily abetted by the suit-makers, to turn an honest penny. But, of course, the Drifter is not suspicious.

* * * * *

FOR himself the Drifter would like to wear overalls if he had the money to buy them. But he sees a better way of keeping his dollars in his pockets. What is needed is the courage to wear old clothing. As things now go you might think a suit of clothes as sensitive as a reputation: one stain, one rent, and the structure is undone. Heroic persons who have dared have found that after the cuff is frayed the coat may nevertheless still be worn, in all essentials as warm and decent as before; they have found that trousers slightly fringed may still be sound at heart; they have found that a waistcoat burned by a falling cigarette will still keep out the wind. The shinyness of serge is not positively organic; the broken threads in tweed may be caught up and the entity preserved; where worsted has grown too thin it may be patched. The patch is the thing. The taboo against it has cost us more than our government or our gum. We must disestablish that taboo. Once there was a technique for the patch; it had traditions and a literature:

Patch beside patch
Is good housewifery;
Patch upon patch
Is sheer beggary.

Let us highly resolve that no suit is ready for the ragman until patch touches patch. Let us show our patches as we show our wounds, proudly. Our clothes are the shock troops in our war with work and weather. Though they grow old and frail, let us prize, pension, and preserve them.

* * * * *

AT last the Drifter has found the man he wishes to be President and the ideal platform upon which to run him. He is Mr. Feri Felix Weiss, for the last thirteen years an Immigration Inspector, who recently, says the Boston *Globe*, "delivered one of the most interesting lectures ever given to the members of Bunker Hill Council, Knights of Columbus, in their clubhouse at Charlestown, Massachusetts." First of all, he proved that it was not Lenin but Bernstorff and his aids who are responsible for the present unrest in America by their harnessing "various restive forces and races to their chariot of destruction." It was very sad, he went on, "that many of the men and women who are enjoying the fat of the land, some of them living in the Back Bay and others graduates of Harvard College, should flirt with these Reds, who are undermining our American institutions, slamming our Constitution, dragging our flag in the mud, and raising the Red flag of anarchy and Bolshevism." But Mr. Weiss hastened to make it clear "that he is positively not a reactionary, that he fully realized that we are all entitled to the four essentials of liberty to enable us to pursue happiness—clean homes, clean clothes, clean food, and *clean wives*." "But all this can be reached," he assured his audience, "by evolution with the aid of the ballot and without resorting to the bullet of a Red revolution." Long live Feri Felix! On that platform of the inalienable right of every American citizen to a clean wife, he cannot escape the White House. THE DRIFTER.

Correspondence

An Open Letter to Senator Lodge

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am addressing the following open letter to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

"It is a matter of gossip in newspaper offices that the report of the Senate sub-committee to investigate Mexican affairs will be presented in the near future. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, you appointed Senator Albert B. Fall as chairman of this sub-committee, and as leader of the Republican majority in the Senate you are doubly responsible for whatever good or evil may issue from this report. This seems a fitting time, therefore, to submit to you a series of questions in the answers to which the populations of the United States of America and the United States of Mexico are vitally interested, and in which the whole of civilization may be assumed to feel a pardonable curiosity.

"Senator Fall has admitted the authorship of certain letters addressed to the bandit Villa, then as now an outlaw against the recognized Government of the United States of Mexico. What other correspondence has passed between Senator Fall and Mexican bandits or outlaws, prior to or during his official investigation of Mexican affairs?

"Senator Fall has admitted the ownership of real estate in Mexico to the extent of $75,000 or more. How did he acquire this property, and would its value be enhanced by armed intervention on the part of the United States in Mexican affairs?

"Senator Fall has admitted that he was for a time attorney for Don Luis Terrazas, one of the largest owners of real property in Mexico, but whose estates were expropriated by the Mexican Government. What fees, retainers, salaries, or other income has Senator Fall received from sources unfriendly to the present Government of Mexico prior to and during his official investigation of Mexican affairs?

"What has been the total cost of the investigation conducted by Senator Fall as chairman of the sub-committee of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations?

"How many copies of the testimony taken before Senator Fall have been printed, how have they been distributed, by whom

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have they been franked, and to what extent is it planned to print and distribute additional copies during the next twelve months?

"Was it within the scope of Senator Fall's sub-committee to have examined the affairs of a Texas bank reputed to act as the American fiscal agent of the bandit Villa and other Mexican outlaws?

"Is it true that the Fall sub-committee has sent spies, male and female, into Mexican territory at the public expense?

"Are the relations between Senator Fall and the leaders of the oil, copper, and financial interests seeking intervention in Mexico, notably with such men as Doheny, Walker, Lee, Boynton, of a political, financial, or purely legal character?

"Do you know of anything for which Senator Fall has been conspicuous since his election to the august body of which you are a leader, other than his hatred of Mexico?

"Do you believe it will be possible to convince anyone that Senator Fall could conduct an impartial hearing on Mexican affairs, in view of his record?

"Do you personally favor seizure of Mexican soil by the United States Government?

"What, in your judgment, would a war with Mexico cost the United States in money, men, and in reputation for fair-dealing with her weaker neighbors?

"Senator, failure to answer these questions will only make of them an indictment against your leadership of the Republican Party and of your conduct in the great office intrusted to you, before the enlightened opinion of America and the world."

New York, April 15 L. J. DE BEKKER

The Italian Situation

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The wretched Fiume business has cost Italy hundreds of millions. Wilson's absurd interference in the situation is once more delaying a much needed settlement for which all the conditions were ripe. As it is, this country has still a million men under arms and is spending probably over a million dollars a month beyond its income. There is a want of raw materials, and the people suffer terribly from the lack of coal and the present high exchange.

Of course, there is unrest. The old liberal elements are swinging into the clerical camp through fear of socialism. In the Chamber the Socialists began as wild men but are already tamed and they have (I hear from a Deputy who is not a Socialist) a real sense of responsibility. Though outwardly professing revolutionary tenets they refrained from taking advantage of the really serious crisis through which Italy has lately passed. There is plenty of horse sense among the people and I do not anticipate violence on a big scale here.

But I do not see how the financial problem can be solved here any more than it can in other countries. The new loan is nominally a huge success and brings in 20 milliards. But it is issued at 87½ which reduces this to 17½ of which almost fourteen are converted treasury notes. When the proceeds are exhausted more inflation must come. The Socialists who are likely to form the next government may even welcome this as the cheapest means of paying old debts.

Economically, the country though active is producing little, and the workmen have little wish to work. Business is carried on with other countries largely on a basis of barter. The most encouraging sign is the growing activity of the middle classes who have taken to business. In many respects the outlook here, I think, is more promising than in France. Ideas are more sober, there is a horror of war, and the people are ready to submit to financial discipline of a kind. They lack all natural resources, and they resent the bad treatment inflicted by their late allies.

In Paris I met Albert Thomas who was frankly pessimistic and told me he thought all Europe would have to put "un moyen élégant de faire banqueroute." He wanted to send a labor delegate to America and asked me if he would be expelled. The reactionary wave in the United States is startling Europe, but Thomas told me it had had a salutary effect on the French workmen who returned from America better pleased with conditions at home. When their ship stopped at the Azores, they expressed satisfaction at being once more in a civilized land!

Florence, Italy, March 3 TRAVELER

Toward the Left

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial on The Outlook for a Labor Party (March 13) overlooks two important considerations for liberals in its reference to the Seattle elections. The first of these was the defeat in the primaries of the incumbent, Mr. C. B. Fitzgerald, who was the original choice of all anti-liberal elements. Mr. Fitzgerald was elevated from the City Council to the mayoralty as the personal selection of Ole Hanson when the latter resigned that office. In the primary campaign he was supported with all of their power by the three "capitalist" newspapers, by the "Associated Industries," which is attempting to establish the "open shop" or "American Plan," and by "Big Business" generally. James Duncan, laborite, as his principal issue, called for the restoration of civil liberties. He had the support of the *Union Record*. Hugh Caldwell, liberal, ran on his singularly clean record as corporation counsel. He was without newspaper support and in reply to the mud batteries of the press took as a slogan: "Shall the newspapers or the people elect the Mayor of Seattle?"

The primary vote was a decisive defeat for the interests identified with Ole Hanson, the corrupt press, "100 per cent. Americanism," and the open shop. Fitzgerald ran third, being defeated in the ratio of 54,000 to 21,000.

In the final election, all of the reactionary interests were compelled to choose between the liberal, Caldwell, and the laborite, Duncan. Very few votes seem to have been changed between the primary and the election. Caldwell held the liberal support he had obtained in the primaries. The earlier newspaper attacks upon him seem to have immunized his campaign from the toxic effects of their subsequent support. Duncan increased his primary vote by a few thousand, receiving nearly 40 per cent of the poll.

My second point is that the line was drawn much farther to the left than in any previous election. Labor candidates of past years are now finding themselves in the extreme right of the Seattle labor movement. Duncan is the center, one might almost say the *mode*, of that movement. Speaking in terms of British analogies, Seattle workers have accepted the Independent Labor party position. Duncan is their Frank Hodges. If Labor party prospects may be measured by the Seattle election, they are very good indeed.

Seattle, Washington, March 23 STUART A. RICE

Lawyers and Liberalism

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I feel particularly singled out by the Quixotic lance of my former tutor, Mr. Leslie J. Tompkins [see "Another Inquisition" in *The Nation* of April 17, 1920], for had his foresight been as good as his hindsight seems to be, I am one of the heretics he should have extirpated while I was at the law school. He placed his imprimatur on my character, and then he "passed the buck" to the other people. At the time when he placed what he called his imprimatur, I undoubtedly was innocent of heresy, and was even qualified to follow Mr. Tompkins into Tammany Hall politics. But why didn't I do so? That is precisely the point. The school and its course, be it to the everlasting credit of Mr. Tompkins, and to the lasting quiescence of his self-con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tained conscience, never led me astray into any independent thought. The fault lies deeper and elsewhere. The contagion is mainly in the books and the libraries. Law students should be forever discouraged from reading Montesquieu, Jefferson, Wendell Phillips, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, reports of industrial commissions, Wilson's "New Freedom," and the dividend notices published in the daily newspapers. And above all, they should avoid the reading of history.

New York, April 21 CHARLES RECHT

What Hope for the Appointee?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The appointment of the new Chief Secretary to Ireland recalls the words which the eminent Dr. Johnson uttered to the Honorable William Windham, when that excellent gentleman was nominated by Lord Northington for the post in 1783 and confided to Johnson his doubts as to whether he was possessed of the necessary qualifications. "Don't be afraid, Sir," said the great man, with a smile, "you will soon make a very pretty rascal." (Boswell's Life of Johnson, edit. Hill, IV, 200). The highminded Windham, a friend of the struggling American Republic, after having reluctantly accepted the Secretaryship under Lord Northington resigned four months afterwards with disgust. An account gives us the reason of his resignation that "Windham believed in Ireland for the Irish" (The Windham Papers, I, page 33). "It was his fixed determination . . . to give every place in his power to Irishmen—as he had long been persuaded that the natives had the best right to the bread of their own land." (Conversation of Windham, reported in Amyot's Memoirs, page 19).

Rochester, N. Y., April 18 EDWARD J. BYRNE

Home-Grown or Imported?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Our neighboring city of Davenport, Iowa, recently elected a Socialist mayor, who seems inclined to do things differently. With a view to substantiate a report, I just called on the editor of the leading daily of that city, and this conversation ensued:

"Is it true that your mayor asked the medical men of your city to select the city physician?"

"Yes."

"Is it true that the engineers were asked to pick out the city engineer?"

"No. But the lawyers were given the choice of city attorney."

"Have you made any comment on this?"

"Oh, yes; we've run stories on it."

"But isn't this like the Russian soviets?"

"You can search me. I know nothing about that."

The fountain head of civic intelligence having so suddenly run dry, I ceased pumping.

Rock Island, Illinois, April 14 E. W.

Are There Others?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: After reading the letters from New York Lawyers under the heading "Are American Liberties Worth Saving?" I remembered the passage in I Samuel, xvi: "Then Jesse called Abinadab, and made him pass before Samuel, and he said, Neither hath the Lord chosen this. Then Jesse made Shammah to pass by. And he said, Neither hath the Lord chosen this. Again Jesse made seven of his sons to pass before Samuel. And Samuel said unto Jesse, The Lord hath not chosen these. And Samuel said unto Jesse, Are here all thy children?"

New York, April 19 P. A. G.

Cooperative Bread and Milk

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: We were very much interested in press notices of Mr. Palmer's threat to prosecute the Sheffield Farms Company, and your paragraph in *The Nation* of March 27. The situation appears in New York to be in the hands of certain groups because of their ability to restrict production and control distribution.

In Detroit we have by coöperative effort bought a creamery and have proceeded painfully step by step to organize the production and delivery of milk at two cents per quart and one cent per pint less than all of the large going concerns. The creamery originally had a 25-can-per-day capacity. We have increased this to 85, and with machinery installed today we expect to increase this to 200, 8,000 quarts per day.

Despite the cut in price our cooperative management is confidently expected to produce in our first creamery a daily net profit of between $80 and $100 per day, and to pay better than 8 per cent on the investment, including a large purchase price and rather expensive extensions. Our manager is instructed to see that the milk excels by several per cent of butter fat any other milk sold in the territory. With this milk we are combining the sale of a superior loaf of bread at fourteen cents instead of sixteen cents. The plan for cutting the price of bread and milk is now conceded by unfriendly but fairly sensible business men to be sound.

Detroit, Michigan, April 10 WALTER M. NELSON

Censored Money Orders

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Do you know that there exists in the United States today a censorship of money orders? There is a magazine, published in Mexico City by a young American, L. E. Gale, which has aroused the wrath of Mr. Burleson through its radical character. This is what happened to a man in Montana quite recently: he sent a money order to Mexico and received the following communication from the post office:

"I have to return the accompanying money order to you with the statement that your request to cash it and to deliver the proceeds to the postmaster at Nuevo Laredo, Mexico, for the purpose of paying subscriptions for *Gale's Magazine* cannot be complied with, for the reason that such is forbidden by the Department. Therefore, your money order is herewith returned that same may be repaid to remitter."

Thus the Post Office Department has apparently ceased to be for the service of the public. The suppression of mail to certain people whom the Postmaster General does not think fit to receive this service is a direct menace to the welfare of this country. Moreover, it is a violation of the constitutional rights of the people, and also of the international postal treaties. In regard to the practical effects of this new measure adopted by Mr. Burleson, it is absolutely stupid, for it does not prevent anybody from subscribing to that magazine, as people can always send their money by check or in cash.

New York, March 8 JOHN MEZ

'Rah for Old England!

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It may, perhaps, interest American readers to learn that the college yell is becoming acclimatized at the Scottish universities and at the newer English universities, though no sound of it has yet been heard at Oxford or Cambridge. The war-cry of the Glasgow students at the Paisley election has given this novelty a big advertisement. The Students' Union at Manchester University, which believes in doing a thing systematically while about it, has offered a prize for the best yell.

London, March 11 H.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

Labor and Liberty

The Labor Market. By D. D. Lescohier. The Macmillan Company.

The American Labor Year Book: 1919-20. The Rand School

The Skilled Labourer. By J. L. and B. Hammond. Longmans, Green and Company.

Labour versus Civilization. By W. H. V. Reade. Longmans, Green and Company.

Democracy and the Press. By F. H. Hayward and B. N. Langdon-Davies. London: National Labour Press.

Liberty and the News. By Walter Lippmann. Harcourt, Brace, and Howe.

WE are in the midst of a genuine reconstruction of social science. Not even the organized effort of reaction can prevent the permeation of the newest literature with a spirit at every point different from the temper of the last twenty-five years. Nor is the breadth of its effort less remarkable than the purpose by which it is moved. The main characteristic of the period following the Napoleonic wars was an effort to reach simplicity despite the greatness of the facts which needed analysis. The Benthamite psychology laid down a few obvious propositions and did not doubt that the evidence could, somehow or other, be brought within their control. It is only within the last fifteen years that we have been able at all fully to escape their thraldom. Our starting-point is the admission of complexity; and, whatever our failures, we do at least realize that there is a vast and trackless area to be covered before we can attain to generalization. We know that inventiveness is the dominating need of the time; but at least we are prepared to wait until the growing organization of social knowledge is adequate to the demands we must make upon it.

Mr. Lescohier's book is a competent recognition of this tradition. It is neither novel nor exciting. It is a sober and well-balanced study of the way in which the sale of labor in the employment market is organized. Broadly speaking, it does on a smaller scale what Sir William Beveridge did for England in his notable study. If Mr. Lescohier's book has a fault, it is his inclination to regard the general background of the present industrial system as permanent and thus to seek essentially the means of mitigating its evils. He does not inquire how far the problem of unemployment is rooted in the very nature of capitalist organization. He does not sufficiently emphasize the psychological results of the evils that he notes. But as a survey of machinery Mr. Lescohier's book is of real value.

"The American Labor Year Book" for 1919-20 is the third issue of a series which has a useful part to play. Unfortunately it is rather an incoherent volume. It tends to be a collection of brief essays upon particular topics instead of an organized survey. Though the arrangement could be better and the statistical tables less partial, still The Year Book contains useful material, much of which is nowhere else easily accessible.

Mr. and Mrs. Hammond conclude their already classic studies of English labor in the industrial revolution with this brilliant volume. It is in no way inferior to its predecessors, than which there is hardly greater praise. Mr. and Mrs. Hammond have made a genuine epic from the daily details of economic life, and the light they have cast upon the psychology of industry goes, perhaps, deeper than in any other historical writing. The most striking fact about the present volume is the modernity of its temper. The history of the recent reaction in America, with prejudiced judges, government espionage, resistance to the plain dictates of humanity, deliberate provocation of labor conflict—all these are the items in the narrative. No man could read this book and leave uncondemned the temper it displays in the governing class. Few would admit that thereby they would be implicitly condemning their own generation. Yet it is a genuine measure of progress to compare this book with some of the older histories, that of Sir Spencer Walpole, for example, or the uninspired chronology of Mr. J. A. R. Marriott. One feels that history is here brought home to the bosoms and minds of men.

Mr. W. H. V. Reade's book is useful because it shows the superiority of such work as that of the Hammonds to that of the men who take refuge from the future in the discovery of fundamental laws. If this book is an index to his attitude, Mr. Reade has decided to perform for our generation the service conferred by Mr. Mallock upon the old. He has discovered that the more necessary a commodity is, the less importance it possesses for civilization. Since labor mainly engages in the production of necessities, it is therefore largely unrelated to those elemental foundations of civilization over which Mr. Reade muses in the placid solemnity of Keble College. Labor, he seems to feel, has lost all sense of proportion. A world in which a coal-miner ranked as high as a college don would be disloyal to Dante and the church and compulsory Greek. Unless the coal-miner is content to hew coal and leave the things of the mind to the quiet contemplation of professors and artists we shall lose the indefinable sense of beauty without which the world would be a sorry place.

The last two volumes here discussed deal with what is perhaps the root of the modern democratic problem. Of the two, that of Mr. Hayward and Mr. Langdon-Davies is much less important. It points out some obvious weaknesses of the English press without having any clear or tangible remedies to present. Mr. Lippmann's book is in an altogether different category. He sees that in a state where public opinion is paramount the control of action depends on the control of the supply of news. The zeal for freedom is therefore a worthless thing unless some guaranty exists that the material upon which it is to act is accurate and free from bias. He points out with truth that, since no liberty can be absolute, the character of what liberty we have will depend always upon the sources from which opinion is formed. Men who read the New York *Times* will want a liberty in substance different from those who read of the same events (they will not read the same facts) in the New York *Call*. How is a sufficient objectivity to be obtained to make the basis of our judgment near enough to the rational to be within the plane of effective argument? Mr. Lippmann has remedies to suggest, though his value lies rather in the brilliant diagnosis of the disease than in the path to its cure that he suggests. Much, he thinks, can be done if the schools of journalism are made as effective as an entrance to the journalistic career as, say, the Harvard Law School is to the practice of the law. He lays emphasis upon a discipline of logic and a training in the value of words. He wants a system of endowed laboratories which will criticize the work of government with the same objective outlook as the Rockefeller Institute has toward a new influenza toxin. Above all he wants a halt in the cut-throat competition between the innumerable radical journals each catering to their tiny public and each preventing the other from becoming a really competent vehicle of news and opinion. The argument is superbly made; and the remarks on the purpose of political science ought to be read and pondered by every professor of government in every university. But in this matter does the remedy lie in mechanisms? Granted that an occasional rich man like Mr. C. P. Scott will make the Manchester *Guardian* the kind of paper that the whole civilized world can admire, still there is no other Manchester *Guardian*. The press in its present form is the inevitable result of an epoch when the foundations of the capitalist system are shaken. Its temper and its character are the means whereby a class on the eve of dispossession is seeking, even at the paltry cost of truth, to maintain its hold on a world that has passed it by. One day, we may hope, Mr. Lippmann will give us that study of public opinion toward which this essay is a pregnant hint. The facts which he has gathered demand remedies more drastic than those here offered.

HAROLD J. LASKI

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whose America?

Our America. By Waldo Frank. Boni and Liveright.

THE task of the historian who five hundred years from now wishes to discover the birth of the genuine American culture will be delightfully simple. The only begetters of this culture are obligingly copyrighting their patents of invention so that there may be no ground for a dispute. The possession of America, in a spiritual sense, has been definitely established. Alongside of such epoch-inaugurating dates as 1453 and 1789 it will hereafter be necessary to reckon the year 1904, in which the creative energies of a great continent attained their conscious being. The place is 291 Fifth Avenue, New York City, the studio of Alfred Stieglitz, who gave America its first taste of modern European art. It is difficult to suggest the proper blend of ecstasy and solemnity with which the name of this place should be uttered. Here beauty in all its forms found true votaries, and from here its gospel was disseminated. It breathed in music through Leo Ornstein and in verse through James Oppenheim. Its critical instrument is H. L. Mencken, whose "authority today over the critical flatlands of the United States is a thing beautiful and delicious to behold." Its intellectual exponent was the late Randolph Bourne. Its rapturous press agent is Waldo Frank, reiterating in tones that never falter the challenging defiance of his title. "Ours," he proclaims, "is the first generation of Americans consciously engaged in spiritual pioneering. . . . Cultural America in 1900 was an untracked wilderness but dimly blazed by the heroic axe of Whitman. . . . Our America is already the discovery of adumbrating groups." And after lavishly decorating his friends with the unmixed colors of his rhetoric, he announces: "To draw the men whom we have drawn, has been to draw America."

It should be explained that Mr. Frank perceives "adumbrating groups" beyond the chosen circle which for a year or two enriched our periodical literature with the *Seven Arts*. In the Middle West the new vision of beauty is represented by Edgar Lee Masters, Theodore Dreiser, Carl Sandburg, and Sherwood Anderson. In New England there are Robert Frost and Amy Lowell, and, somewhat unexpectedly, Henry Adams, whose autobiography is represented as "a cry for the new gods that he cannot see." In writing of persons outside his coterie Mr. Frank shows occasional capacity for critical discrimination, but as objects recede in time they begin to wither under the annihilating blasts of his fire. Before 1900 only Whitman and Thoreau survive; and the real genius of these two, it goes without saying, is something which none have felt or understood before the new apocalyptic criticism shone upon them. "When we were boys, we all had tedious uncles who professed to be very fond of Thoreau. They said that Thoreau was a great naturalist; that he wrote delightfully of butterflies and mushrooms. These uncles were typical good citizens of old America; altogether dull—mindless and sober paragons. We took it for granted that Thoreau also was a stuffy bore. We left him alone. . . . It is time, however, we woke up to the wicked, destructive fellow Thoreau really was; give him the bad name that is his due." Very grudgingly does Mr. Frank yield to Americans the great gift of Lincoln's heart and spirit. Much might be forgiven him for his rapt veneration of the miracle of that life, and there would be no offense in saying that America is not mature enough to know what is the nature of her wealth in Lincoln, if it were said by one in whose sympathy there was less of condescension.

We should like to be appreciative toward a great deal in this book if its author were less rasping, less intent upon antagonizing and irritating at every turn. His tribute to the wistful beauty of the perished culture of our red men and his analysis of the industrial and spiritual genius of the Jew in America would evoke a readier response if the motivation were more disinterested. The idea underlying and pervading the book is highly relevant to the present phase of our literary development. There is no escaping the charge that our older literature stood aloof from the forces which absorbed the active energies of Americans, that there is consequently a certain unreality about it which makes it inapplicable to the actual strivings of American life. Art, if it is to be a vital thing for its creators and possessors, cannot be maintained as a holiday affair but must spring directly from the dreams and habits which absorb men daily. Such ideas have been presented by Mr. Van Wyck Brooks with rare temper and discriminating persuasiveness. For Mr. Brooks's scholarly refinement and modulation Mr. Waldo Frank has substituted explosive violence, a tone as strident as Vachel Lindsay's calliope, a style of restless lines and splotches of color.

JACOB ZEITLIN.

According to Dreiser

Hey Rub-a-Dub-Dub. By Theodore Dreiser. Boni and Liveright.

THE Dreiser who emerges in these essays is anything but the pachydermatous animal that has caused so much alarm in respectable circles. He is very like a perplexed and weary child, dazzled by a kaleidoscope in which he is able to discern no thread of meaning. One receives the impression of an essentially passive, diffident, and highly sensitive spirit that has been hurt by life and is yet perpetually charmed anew by its "active, dancing, changeful" beauty. "Personally," he says somewhere, "I stand with the fools of love, because I think for all their follies and errors and Lear-like end, they are happier." He ranges himself, in short, with the Sister Carries and Jennie Gerhardts of his own creation.

And the view of life which he presents is just such a view as Jennie might have held, amplified, articulated in a measure, but still dark, jumbled, limited, instinctive, and sentimental. He likes life, "this sharp, grasping scheme of things"; he likes "Mr. Woolworth's splendid tower"; he likes everything that is "vivid, colorful, human"; he likes change and believes in it—"for by change have come all the spectacles, all the charms, and all the creature comforts of which our consciousness is aware." Furthermore, he likes the American Financier and writes a chapter to show that although Russell Sage and Jay Gould were probably inacceptable in polite society, and might have done much more for art, they at least achieved that "avid forceful expression" that so delights "God, Good, Nature, Force, the Universal Substance." Isn't that Jennie all over? If Jennie had been appointed foreman of a railway gang she would have resigned, too, and for just the reason Mr. Dreiser gives in The Toil of the Laborer: "Not to drive where I could not ease, not to urge where I could not repay, not to be a tool in the hands of their indifferent masters who could not or would not interest themselves in them, was something, even though my ceasing could not relieve them of their toil." Jennie knew quite well that the race is to the strong and that it is mere rubbish, the theory of the uplifters that all you have to do is to reach out and Take the World and It's Yours. As for Secrecy—Its Value, another of the Dreiserian themes, Jennie never had a doubt of that. "The charm that would disappear with the arrival of absolute frankness, the mystery that would go! . . . We do not know [the creatures of the earth]; we do not understand them; we wonder at their states, their thoughts, their moods, what they will do, which way turn when attacked, whom attack, whom deceive, whom praise, whom reward. Secrecy—secrecy—mystery. If it were gone the illusion of life itself, which is all that it is, would be gone also. And we are cautioned to love truth and to say truly and to our own hurt if necessary!" Can't you hear Jennie saying that? Add the obsession of sex; an extreme skepticism on the subject of permanent unions ("Does the average strong, successful man confine himself to one woman? Has he ever?"); a conception of reformers,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saints, and messiahs as magnified vice investigators, equally futile if not equally impertinent; a general surrender to Nature because Nature wins anyway; and a view of life as the "mere idle rocking of force in one direction or another"—and you have the complete *Weltanschauung* of, well, one of the most beautifully and tenderly drawn women in American fiction.

In his novels Mr. Dreiser seems very much the thinker. One is astonished, consequently, to find how unsublimated a product he is of the benighted environment he describes in his last essay when he has no characters through whom to express himself. Very simple and almost purely emotional is the reaction upon life cloaked in the scientific verbiage of this book. One asks oneself whether the soul of Jennie Gerhardt is not really the soul of Mr. Dreiser himself and whether that doesn't explain the ceaseless thrill with which he has felt the magnetism of all those agents of "avid force," those dinosaurs of the dollar he so loves to track through the American jungle. One thing is certain: he is far more interesting as the painter of Jennie's life than as the recorder of Jennie's views.

VAN WYCK BROOKS

Drama in Russia

The Russian Theatre Under the Revolution. By Oliver M. Sayler. Little, Brown and Company.

Russia White or Red. By Oliver M. Sayler. Little, Brown and Company.

MANY are the Americans who during the last three years have plunged for adventure or copy into the maelstrom of the Russian revolution. We know of only one who followed the quest of pure beauty and whose sojourn has yielded a rich gain for lovers of art. While the greatest of living dramas was being unfolded, Mr. Oliver Sayler traveled from Indiana across the Pacific and Siberia to study the mimic stage of Moscow and Petrograd. It is no cause for exclamation when the soldier and dreamer of humanity rushes into the melee without regard for his personal safety, but it is a rare ardor which, for the sake of satisfying an aesthetic curiosity, will face such uncertainties and hardships as life in Russia's capitals offered. Mr. Sayler reached Moscow while the battle which marked the overthrow of Kerensky's government was still raging in the streets. Several months later he hastened to Petrograd when everybody was running from there in fear of the approaching Germans. It was an admirable exhibition of American enterprise and pluck, yet not too great for the theme which inspired it. For the record which he has produced describes the most interesting and vital stage of modern times. Students of the theater everywhere must either be impressed with its unexpectedness or consumed with envy at the display of such wealth in a country which is supposed to be so far behind in its cultural development. Consider the range of plays which was open to the theater-goer of Moscow as soon as the noise of fighting had died away. Aside from several operas, Russian and Italian, there was a choice, on the first night of Mr. Sayler's arrival, of plays by Maeterlinck, Chekhov, Andreyev, Tolstoy, Gogol, and Merezhkovsky, to mention only names well known outside of Russia. In Petrograd, on the first day, it was the same story—operas by Rimsky-Korsakov, Tchaikovsky, and Bizet, plays by Euripides, Ostrovsky, Andreyev, Merezhkovsky, Maurice Donnay, Ibsen, Maeterlinck, and Schnitzler. This opulence is the more amazing in view of the prevailing repertory system; a wholly different assortment of plays was to be seen on the following day. It is doubtful whether such a showing could be surpassed by any European capital even in the piping times of peace.

But it is not in the richness of the dramatic repertory that the importance of the Russian theater consists so much as in the fertility and inventiveness of its stagecraft. The stage is alive with creative energy, athrill with novel experiments, literally teeming with ideas, exuberantly overflowing into cults and eccentricities. Into all these experiments and ideas Mr. Sayler enters with an infectious enthusiasm. At times, indeed, he yields his judgment too completely to the spell of novelty, as in his reaction to that strange blend of mysticism and experimental psychology invented by Nikolai Yevreynov and by him called "monodrama." The theory of this form, Mr. Sayler thinks, "is the most intriguing accretion to the realm of aesthetics in many years, the most pregnant gift of Russian genius to the theater of our time." He does not trust his own language to interpret the elusive principles of monodrama, but relies on a manifesto of Yevreynov himself. The reviewer also shrinks from the task of exposition and gladly takes shelter under a few of Yevreynov's sentences. Monodrama is defined as "the kind of dramatic representation which endeavors with the greatest fullness to communicate to the spectator the soul state of the acting character, and presents on the stage the world surrounding him as he conceives it at any moment in his stage experience." It represents the life of the spirit, and deals not with external realities but with the internal reflections of the real objects. What this means in terms of practical stage management may be gathered from an illustration. "The cheerful meadow, field, and forest which I admire, sitting free from care beside my sweetheart, will become a bright green spot, yellow furrows, and dark age [*sic*] only if at that moment I be notified of a misfortune that has happened to some one near me. And the author of the perfect drama in the sense that I understand it will fix in a remark these two moments of the setting surrounding us; pedantically he will demand from the decorator an instantaneous change of the cheerful landscape to a stupid combination of tiresome green, disquieting yellow, and gloomy olive colors, and he will be right in his pedantry." The theory certainly does not lack daring, yet we must confess a feeling of considerable relief on being assured that Yevreynov does not mean to displace all other dramatic forms with his perfect drama.

Another aspect of theatrical revolt is represented by the Kamerny Theater, to whose symbolic, cubist technique Mr. Sayler devotes several chapters. There is an element of protest also in the emphasis which Meyerhold, the manager of the Alexandrinsky in Petrograd, places on the theatricality of the theater. The reversion to an apron extended twenty feet beyond the proscenium arch, the innumerable curtains, and, most striking of all, the illuminated auditorium, are for the purpose of making the spectator feel that he is attending a play and not watching a cross-section of life. But all this revolting and protesting, interesting as it is, is an indirect tribute to the influence of the stage against which the revolt is active, the Moscow Art Theater, justly entitled by Mr. Sayler "the world's first theater." At this playhouse the great actor-manager Stanislavsky developed the art of realistic production to its highest point, relying on "a certain repression, a holding back, a minimization—the utter pole of the exaggeration which characterized the old florid, rhetorical theater and now once more the theater of the impressionists and the futurists." Mr. Sayler is as appreciative of one aspect as of the other. But the superiority of the last-named theater over its rivals is apparent in its responsiveness to the needs of Russian literary art. It devised the form of production best suited to the simple realism of Russia's great writers, who present life with a minimum of theatricality. It was by staging Chekhov's first play, "The Sea Gull," that the theater gained its reputation, and it was the success of this staging that brought into being the rest of Chekhov's plays. To have stimulated the writing of these would in itself be enough to justify the labors of a theatrical producer. But Gorky and Tolstoy and the older masters profited equally by the method, and its influence has been felt wherever the stage is seriously studied. One wonders what will become of this marvellous artistic development under the new dispensa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. For, while Mr. Sayler calls his book "The Russian Theater under the Revolution," the productions which he saw had all been prepared in previous years. It was only the rich accumulated repertory of the playhouses which made possible such a season as he witnessed and so fascinating a book as his.

Mr. Sayler has written another book, "Russia White or Red," describing the manner of life in the land of revolution during his stay. The value of his account is in its freedom from political interest. Without prejudice toward either White or Red but with sympathy for the struggles and sufferings of both sides, he simply relates what he observed of the surface and common movement of things. Having no official status with any organization, enjoying only such privileges and immunities as pertained to American citizenship, he had to get his food like other people and to submit to much the same restrictions. It is curious how little there is in his story of violence or terrorism, though he lived as the guest of a bourgeois in an elaborate mansion; one might have expected that his great regard for his aristocratic host would have filled him with rancor toward the rabble. Incidentally one may gather other instructive hints. Mr. Sayler's journey out of Russia, for example, was made at the same time as the great retreat of the Czecho-Slovaks. When he arrived at Vladivostok he notes his surprise at finding no sign in the harbor of the vessels which were to transport these heroic troops to the western front. Alas for human faith!

J.

Souls Trapped

The Judgment of Peace. By Andreas Latzko. Translated by Ludwig Lewisohn. Boni and Liveright.

"MEN in War" set war forth as a rat-pit, where desperate creatures tore one another with furious fangs, not because they chose, but because, huddled bestially in the pit, they turned to beasts, fighting each to save himself out of the snarling mass, though many of them guessed that they were being pitted merely for the amusement of gorgeous sportsmen who blinked down at the frenzy, applauded, laid wagers on their blood, and carried away prizes for their victory. "The Judgment of Peace," more philosophical, widens the walls of the pit until they are as wide as the World War but as narrow as a prison, in which free spirits are inclosed, suffering not so much from their tortures as from their loss of the liberty without which life has neither dignity nor decency nor desirability. George Gadsky, protagonist, is indeed exceptional to the extent that as a great and successful musician he has known a larger liberty than most common soldiers, and more deeply than most resents the savage, senseless discipline which he has to endure in the German army. So is Weiler exceptional, the impassioned young poet, and Ensign von Krülow, who, though taught war from his cradle, has never submitted to its dogmas. They are exceptional, but, Latzko constantly urges, so is every man exceptional. To every man his life is dear, and it is death to squeeze him into some iron mold where his spirit cannot breathe. For the expansive intervals of war-making—the passion of surrender, the rapture of sacrifice, the huge taste of danger—Latzko has hardly a word, and only a word of scorn. George Gadsky, indeed, in the beginning had been caught up with the high-flying will of the mass and had put on his uniform in a lifted mood. All this perishes before the reality of monotonous barracks, stupid or brutal sergeants, the obscene horrors of the actual field. In his spirit Gadsky is at every moment mutineer and traitor against the tyranny which aims to annihilate him. At every moment he wildly struggles in his trap.

Like "Men in War," "The Judgment of Peace" is swift and strong, lucid and incandescent, appalling and irresistible. It strikes, it is true, many chords that were sounded in the earlier book, particularly stressing the bitter tragedy which puts kindly fathers to the task of killing other men's sons and the bitter farce by which some patriots are saved for places of security and profit and the rest sent to the mortal forefront of the battle. It pictures again the bloody wounds which never show in a victorious procession. So, however, does war repeat these things. The trouble is that peace forgets them. Already "war books" are a drug. Our nerves no longer reach to France or Flanders as they did. Those who hate war most find themselves in the paradoxical position of feeling obliged to keep alive the knowledge of war—of war as it really is and not as it will tend to seem as time heals the deep gashes of our five years and the perennial human passion for making myths begins its work. If we allow the war to turn into a mere piece of history we shall be preparing the way for more wars, as soon as the horrors of this one have grown dim. It is for this reason that Latzko's fierce arraignment and mighty tract should be welcomed by lovers of peace and should be kept alive in order that an epic memory all plumes and purple may not go down from our generation.

C. V. D.

Drama

Marionettes

The Book of Marionettes. By Helen Haiman Joseph. B. W. Huebsch.

TOWARD the close of the nineteenth century children and simple folk in Europe still saw the puppets or played with them as unreflectively as their remotest ancestors had done. In windy summers or russet autumns Italians displayed their marionettes in amusement parks far in the North of Europe. The gaudily painted little stage was set up in the open; the benches in front of it were firmly fastened in the earth. The marionettes were rather tall and their movements very angular. But they were all emperors or clowns, very stately or full of the broadest fun, and their robes had once been stiff with brocade and gold. And a child who saw this show with his nursemaid might then go home and in his play-room snuggle into a curtained box (Punch and Judy Show or Kasperletheater), take the limp dolls, and make very vivid things of them by placing his index finger in the head, his thumb and second finger into the hollow arms, and letting them go through a strange mixture of the old folk-plays and of his own day-dreams.

The child and his nurse-maid did not have to play at make believe. To them there existed no distinction between appearance and reality, feigning and fact. Their world had not yet been divided between day and dream. It was of one stuff throughout; they were free of all its regions and could pass from one to another without jar. Only by recalling or recovering that state of mind can we understand the origin and persistence of the puppets. They belong to the old, old dream world of myth and ritual and fairy lore. To those who first fashioned them they were not dolls but men and gods, like the winged bulls and sphinxes that were first carved with hands and then adored. To abandon the modern theater to them, as mystical enthusiasts would have us do, would be to give up in this art the slow gains of the critical intelligence—our one weapon against delusion and cruelty and dread. But as the clearest-minded will stop amid the bitter business of the world to read a fairy tale, so there are moods when the puppets may take us back to our own childhood and to the childhood of the race.

The history and aspect of the puppets are both charmingly recorded by Mrs. Joseph in her "Book of Marionettes." She writes with a fantastic, airy touch that suits her subject, and her illustrations are chosen with admirable erudition and taste. Puppets have been found in Thebes and in Attica, but time has dealt roughly with them. They came from the Orient in the beginning, and of the true folk marionettes those from the far East are still the best. The rounded marionettes of Java hold the dim dreams and terrors of their makers, and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wooden puppets of Burma have an eerie gaiety. The Cingalese puppets are, evidently, of an incomparable delicacy and precision of workmanship. They have a sad and wondering gravity of expression; they were made by a folk that knew strangeness to have a beauty of its own. The shadow figures of the Eastern islands are grotesque and wildly fierce, those of China calmer and stealthier in their cruelty; the puppet-heads of Japan are bland, but behind their wan smiles lurk fear and horror. All these puppets were made in faith, in rapt and dreamy earnestness, and the shows aroused pity and terror.

The Christian centuries put the marionettes to more definitely religious uses. But side by side with these the puppets served to embody other figures of the folk imagination—Pulcinella and Arlecchino, Punch and Judy, Kasperle and Frau Ritter Pantoflius—which all betrayed the humor and the realistic spirit of the West. They persisted through later centuries and presented popular legends, some recent, some of incredible antiquity, and the booths of the puppet shows were as regular as jugglers and magicians at festivals and fairs. It was at such a booth that Goethe in his childhood saw the puppet play of Doctor Faust, which has been preserved in the version used at Ulm and illustrates in its three parts, sub-divided into tiny acts, the character of the later plays of the puppet shows. But here we are on or very near the dividing line between a more ancient and more modern mood. The latter was soon to drive the puppets out. They do not thrive amid reasoning and motivated actions. They and their spectators must stay within the land of dreams.

Now, of course, no adult can go quite naively to a puppet show. It remains a curiosity and an experiment in aesthetic experience. Thus it is significant that the best of the very few theaters devoted to puppets in the world, the Marionetten Theater Münchner Künstler, is an exponent in miniature of the subtlest and most exquisite devices of the modern craftsmanship of the stage. The marionettes of Mrs. Maurice Browne in the Little Theater in Chicago, those of the Cleveland Playhouse, and of Mr. Tony Sarg in New York all share that sophistication, even when they strive most to approach the simplicity of the old figures. Their makers do not really believe in them and their audiences bring them no creative faith. Only the marionettes of Richard Teschner of Vienna escape this difficulty. He was influenced by the Javanese shadow play. But his little figures have the faintly poignant morbidness of all the costly maladies of the modern soul, and one can imagine them dancing to faint verses of Verlaine or playing the obscurer visions of Hofmannsthal or the moralities of Arthur Symons. But their frail forms would wither in the booths of the market place.

It is a great pity that the puppets cannot serve some of their ancient uses among the many simple people who are necessarily beyond the reach of the modern art of the theater. In every village of the land there is a moving picture show, and the stories told on the screen by the images of real people in real places are of a conscious and malignantly corrupting falseness. In them murder is represented as a small affair, war as a sort of super-football, getting the better of one's neighbor as the chief end of man. The lithe, brown men who still watch the grave faces of their puppet kings and queens act their old legends in Ceylon are far less ignobly deluded. But a realism of means, of reproduction, is confused among us with reality of content, and one wonders whether the villagers of southern Ohio or of the North Carolina mountains would not laugh incredulously at a puppet show that brought them a truth of poetry and of dreams and legends. Perhaps their children would yield themselves to the lure of fairy-plays and thus undergo a cleansing of the imagination. The hope is forlorn as are the puppets themselves in the modern world. But their history is full of fascination and of the infinitely quaint grace expressed by Gounod in his Funeral March of a Marionette. With grave, precise, and slightly mincing steps the little figures pass and are lost in the dusk.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

BRENTANO'S RECOMMEND

The Following Leading Books on the Labor Question

The History of Trade Unionism

(Revised Edition, Extended to 1920)

By Sidney and Beatrice Webb. **Cloth, $7.50**

The Story of the Dramatic Progress of Labour in Great Britain from 1890 to 1920 is here described, including the Coal and Railway Struggles of 1919, the Controversy as to Direct Action and the Future Forms of Industrial Democracy, and the Rise of the Labour Party—preceded by a completely revised account of the previous history of the Trade Union Movement since 1666.

19,000 copies of a special edition have been bought by Trade Unionists before publication.

The Casual Laborer and Other Essays

By Carlton H. Parker with an introduction by Cornelia S. Parker. **Cloth, $2.00**

A collection of the essays of a writer whose career was so vividly presented in "An American Idyll."

National Guilds and The State

By S. G. Hobson. **Cloth, $4.00**

Partial table of Contents:
Producers and Consumers—Distribution—Function and the Class-Struggle—Nation, State, and Government. Signs of Change—The Workshop—The Influence of the War Upon Labour—The Profiteer—The Equities of Expropriation—The Civil Guilds.

A Short History of the American Labor Movement

By Mary Beard. **Cloth, $1.50**

A brief and simple summary of the aims and achievements of the Labor Movement in the United States from the end of the eighteenth Century to the present day, including the origin and growth of trade-unions, the development of the American Federation of Labor, the growth of the more radical organizations, and the new currents of thought and action that have developed out of the World War.

The Housing of the Unskilled Wage Earner

By Edith Elmer Wood. **Cloth, $2.25**

The American Wage Earner's next great problem.

Current Social and Industrial Forces

Edited by Lionel D. Edie. **Cloth, $2.50**

Every wide awake American who is interested in his own fortune and America's future should be interested in this book because it defines and describes in manysided ways the forces and ideals which underly current restlessness, disturbances and fear.

The Intellectuals and the Wage Workers

A study in Educational Psychoanalysis by Herbert Ellsworth Cory. **Cloth, $2.00**

Postage Additional

BOOKSELLERS TO THE WORLD

BRENTANO'S

Retail Book Department

Fifth Avenue and 27th Street

New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Music

Fair Play

IF the concert programs of the season can be safely trusted, the ban upon German music has at last been lifted. German songs are creeping back in French and English attire; instrumental favorites are coming into greater prominence; and the only trace of hysteria being evidenced is that of certain symphonic conductors who are frantically hastening to overload their programs with the old, familiar classics. Patriotically, we have gained little, if anything, by this war-time prohibition. Music may be used as propaganda, as it was by nearly every country during the late war, but in itself it will always remain above politics. There is, perhaps, a certain logic in not wishing to hear a language while it is still associated with inimical deeds and ideas; but on the other hand it would be a poor cause indeed that could not withstand a great symphony, sonata, or song written by an adversary.

As a matter of fact, German music has never been in any danger from any but Germans themselves. As early as 1905 Romain Rolland, in commenting on the Strassburg festival of that year, said: "The most remarkable thing of all is that German artists are gradually losing the power of understanding their own splendid classics and, in particular, Beethoven." Go through an orchestral season in New York today and you will find the same thing: a listless, a militaristic, or a neurasthenic Beethoven, but never the living spirit of the great master. And you will find, too, what Rolland complained of so bitterly after this same Strassburg festival, when he exclaimed: "If people wish to institute a joust between French and German art, let it be a fair one . . . let Wagner be matched with Berlioz, and Strauss with Debussy, and Mahler with Dukas or Magnard." Not only is this same plea equally appropriate now, but we could for like reason substitute the word American for French. True, we have not yet a Berlioz, or Debussy, a Dukas, or a Magnard, but we have got composers who are beginning to say gracious things in a charming and original way, and their cause is considerably damaged when they are crushed between Wagner and Brahms, or Wagner and Beethoven, as those who present them thus doubtless know.

It is because the German musicians of today have adopted such methods, it is because they have lost their vision and have yielded to the power rather than to the responsibilities of their leadership, and *not* because of German music itself that the temporary banishment of the latter has been of such aesthetic and educational value. It forced us to explore the musical literature of other countries; forced us, also, to study it seriously and try to comprehend its message. As a result, we have begun to recognize more than novelty in the works of Moussorgsky and Scriabine and Strawinsky, of Debussy and Ravel and Dukas; to realize that what we have been belittling are, in reality, vital forces that have, for the last decade or more, been accomplishing a profound if silent revolution. And having brushed souls with the Russians, and gazed into the calm, clear pool of the French mind, we can no longer view German philosophy from the old angle. Our whole perspective has changed.

What we have gained, then, by this non-German interregnum has been a fresh aspect of German music—a clearer insight into its weaknesses, a deeper and truer appreciation of its strength and its beauties; a knowledge and respect, if not always an understanding, of the movements going on in the Northern and Latin countries of Europe; a sense of color and line and nuance that have greatly changed the character of our programs; and, most important of all, a certain musical freedom of thought, a certain ability to hear through our own, instead of through German, ears. We can never again afford to lose any of these. We can never again afford to let any one nation so dominate us that we cannot hear what the others are saying.

HENRIETTA STRAUS

Modern China

A Political Study

By S. G. CHENG

Net $3.25

A valuable and timely volume throwing a clear light on the chief problems of modern China, with constructive suggestions for their solution. The discussion is notably free from political bias and deserves the close attention of all interested in Chinese matters.

Moslem Architecture

Its Origins and Development

By G. T. RIVOIRA

Net $21.00

An original work of the greatest value describing the development of the Mosque in Syria, Egypt, Armenia and Spain from its birth down to the twelfth century. The remarkable series of photographs collected by the author are finely reproduced on 158 plates. Every student of architecture should become familiar with this work.

At all booksellers or from the publishers

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch
35 West 32nd Street
New York

Bertrand Russell

seems to us to mark the close of an epoch in modern thought with these significant words:

"I am one of those who, as a result of the war, have passed over from Liberalism to Socialism—not because I have ceased to admire many of the Liberal ideals, but because I see little scope for them, except after a complete transformation of the economic structure of society."

If you are still desperately a liberal—if you have seen your ideals of liberty nullified by capitalism and war, but have not been willing to "pass over" into the ranks of Socialism,—if you have grave fears of the repudiation of your ideals by a victorious Bolshevik revolution, you must read Bertrand Russell's candid discussion of your intellectual predicament.

Do you believe that the price of revolution is too great to pay for the realization of your ideals?

Read Bertrand Russell on "Democracy and Revolution" in the May number of

The Liberator

The Liberator,
138 West 13th Street, New York. (n)

Enclosed find $2.50. Send me the Liberator for one year, beginning with the May number.

Name.....

Address.....

Add 50c. for postage outside U. S.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Contents

ON THE LABOR FRONT IN RUSSIA
- The Labor Laws of Soviet Russia 600
- The First Russian Labor Army 601
- Trotzky to the First Labor Army 601
- The Red Militia 602

DECISIONS OF THE FRENCH SOCIALISTS 602
THE SECRET CONGRESS AT AMSTERDAM 603
BRITISH LABOR AND THE COOPERATIVES 604
EVENTS OF THE WEEK 605

The Labor Laws of Soviet Russia

THE following official summary and explanation of the Code of Labor Laws of Soviet Russia has been secured from the Russian Soviet Government Bureau at New York.

The fundamental principle underlying the labor laws of Soviet Russia is that society owes everybody a living. The community is like one family, every member of which is supported out of the family income. The labor law speaks of "citizens." In practice, however, there is no difference between citizens and aliens because any person may become a citizen by a mere declaration of intention to become one.

It goes without saying that since everyone is entitled to a seat at the community table, every able-bodied person is required to contribute his or her share towards the work which is necessary to provide the community with the means for the support of its members. This is described as "compulsory labor."

The obligation to work for the community begins with the age of sixteen and terminates at the age of fifty. Old persons are supported by the community; likewise all persons who are permanently or temporarily incapacitated for work. This includes women for a period of eight weeks before and eight weeks after confinement. School children are required to take manual training at school.

The community undertakes to provide every person with work. If no work can be found for any able-bodied person, he or she is entitled to a full wage or salary for the whole time of his or her involuntary idleness.

As far as practicable, every worker must be assigned to work at his trade or profession, if he has any, and at his usual place of residence. If there is no opening in a person's chosen field of work, he may be assigned to and must accept another class of work. If, however, the work is of a lower grade, the worker is nevertheless entitled to his regular compensation which he would receive if employed at his own trade or profession. If no employment can be found for a worker within the district where he resides, he may be assigned to work in another district.

Night work is prohibited for all persons under the age of eighteen, and for women of all ages. The same classes are excluded from all kinds of employment which are considered "especially hard or dangerous."

In nationalized industries the terms of employment are regulated by rules framed by the labor organizations, subject to the approval of the People's Commissariat of Labor, which corresponds to the Department of Labor of the United States. In establishments operated by private capital the terms of employment are regulated by rules agreed upon between the owners or directors of the establishments and the labor unions, likewise subject to approval by the People's Commissariat of Labor. If no agreement can be reached between capital and labor the terms of employment are drawn up by the trade unions and submitted for approval to the People's Commissariat of Labor. This provision of the Soviet labor laws is theoretically tantamount to compulsory arbitration. It must be borne in mind, however, that the People's Commissariat of Labor is a Soviet institution, in the election of which labor has a dominating vote.

A normal working day must not exceed eight hours for day work and seven hours for night work. The normal working day for persons under eighteen years of age must not exceed six hours. In especially hard and dangerous occupations the normal day must likewise not exceed six hours. If the character of the work is such that it cannot be stopped at the end of a normal working day, two or more labor shifts must be engaged. Overtime is permitted only in emergencies. Where the emergency would not endanger human life or involve interruption in water supply, lighting, sewerage, or transportation, overtime work is permitted only with the consent of the labor unions whose membership is affected. No persons under eighteen years of age, nor any women are permitted to work overtime. In no case may overtime exceed four hours in the course of two consecutive weeks, nor may overtime work be resorted to more than on fifty days during the year. The guiding idea is that whenever it may be foreseen that the work of any establishment cannot be completed with the regular force within a normal working day, additional shifts of workers must be provided for.

Every worker is entitled to a vacation with pay of two weeks in every six months.

In order to avoid as far as possible disputes between individual wage earners and the employers of labor over the performance of the terms of employment, every worker is provided with a "labor booklet," in which must be entered the terms of his employment, the quantity of work performed, the amount of wages received by him, and all other particulars relating to his work and payment.

The right to "hire and fire" is not left to the discretion of the employer. Before any person is permanently engaged he must undergo a probation period of one week; in nationalized establishments the probation period is two weeks for unskilled labor and one month for skilled labor. If any employee is rejected after probation he may appeal to his union. If his union considers his complaint justified it may enter into negotiations with his employer. Should negotiations fail the matter may be submitted to the local office of the Commissariat of Labor, which may order the appointment of the complainant to a permanent position or may dismiss his complaint. After a person has been appointed to a permanent position he may be discharged for unfitness only with the consent of his labor union. Both the employer and the employee may appeal the matter to the local and the district office of the Commissariat of Labor, respectively. The decision of the district office is final.

Every wage earner is required to turn out the standard output fixed for his class and grade of work by the valuation committee of his labor union, subject to the approval of the Commissariat of Labor, representing the interests of labor, and the Council of National Economy, representing the interests of national industry. A wage earner, who falls below the standard may be demoted by decision of the valuation committee of his union, but he may appeal from that decision to the local and the district office of the Commissariat of Labor. The decision of the district office is final. In case of negligence or bad faith a wage earner may be discharged without notice, subject to the agreement of his labor union.

A worker may be discharged in case of a shut-down of the establishment or of suspension of work for more than a month or in case of cancellation of special orders. The discharge of a worker for these reasons is likewise appealable to the local and district offices of the Commissariat of Labor. In every case the worker is entitled to two weeks' notice of the proposed discharge.

On the other hand, the worker is not at liberty to quit his job at pleasure. He must tender his resignation, which must be passed upon by the shop committee. If the shop committee, after a hearing, declines to accept the resignation, the wage earner must remain at work, but he may appeal to his trade

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

union whose decision is final. A wage earner who disobeys these rules is barred from other employment for one week and forfeits his unemployment benefit for that period. These rules do not apply, however, to personal service and to temporary employment, where the worker is at liberty to quit at pleasure.

In order to carry into effect the principles which have been summarized in the preceding paragraphs, suitable machinery has been provided by the labor code. Every wage earner must enrol with some labor organization, whereupon he is assigned by the valuation committee of his union to a certain trade and class. This is in principle a continuation and extension of the guild system, which existed under the old laws of the Russian Empire.

A system of labor inspection has been provided for under the jurisdiction of the People's Commissariat of Labor. Labor inspectors are elected by the central bodies of the trade unions. The powers of the labor inspectors are very wide. They may enter at any time of day or night every industrial establishment, as well as the lodgings provided by the employers for their workers. They may adopt special rules for the removal of conditions endangering the life and health of employees. They may require the production by the management of all the books and records of the establishment, and they may prosecute all persons violating the provisions of the labor code.

The First Russian Labor Army

TO meet the needs of economic reconstruction, labor armies have been created from the forces of the Red Army in Soviet Russia to be utilized in transportation, road and bridge building, and agricultural work. Four labor armies have so far been formed. By a decree signed on January 15 by N. Lenin, President of the Soviet of Defense, the Third Red Army from the Ural front was converted as a unit into the First Revolutionary Labor Army with Leon Trotzky as Commander-in-Chief. The principal articles of the decree follow:

The region of work of the Third Army must correspond with the location of the main sections of that army, and will be decided by secret orders from the executive branch of the army, and confirmed by the Soviet of the Labor Army.

The Revolutionary Soviet of the Labor Army is the directing organization of the work to be performed in the field of economic service undertaken by the Labor Army generally.

The Revolutionary Soviet of the Labor Army shall consist of members of the Army Soviet including accredited representatives from the Supreme Soviet of National Economy, and the national Commissariats of Agriculture, Labor, and Transportation. A specially authorized Soviet of Defense with directing powers will be placed at the head of this Soviet.

The Revolutionary Soviet of the Labor Army shall have the decisive vote in all questions relating to internal military organization decided according to established rules of internal management, thus enabling that organization to introduce such changes and regulations as the economic conditions demand.

The representatives of the different Soviet administrative organs attached to the Soviet of the Labor Army shall decide matters relating to their respective fields of work such as fuel, supplies, transportation, etc. In case of fundamental disagreement the matter in dispute shall be referred to the authority and decision of the Soviet of Defense.

All the local organizations of the Soviet of National Economy, the Commissariats of Supply, Agriculture, etc., are hereby made subject to the orders and instructions of the Soviet of the Labor Army as issued by it as a whole, or through its individual authorized representatives, in all cases requiring the mass application of labor effort. All local Soviet organizations shall remain at their respective posts of duty and execute through their normal channels such work as is required in order to realize the economic plans of the Soviet of the Labor Army.

Qualified workers will be relieved from military duties for work in local factories and other economic organizations by order of the respective members of the Soviet of the Labor Army, if such workers are not absolutely needed for army purposes. Qualified workers may be thus relieved only with the consent of the economic organization in charge of the factory in question. Workmen belonging to professional unions may be removed from local factories for economic military purposes only with the consent of the respective local organizations.

Trotzky to the First Labor Army

THE following text of the order issued by Trotzky to the first Revolutionary Labor Army is taken from the *Krasnaya Gazeta* (Petrograd) of January 18.

(1) The First Army has finished its war task, but the enemy is not yet completely dispersed. The greedy imperialists are still menacing Siberia in the extreme Far East, where the mercenary armies of the Entente are still threatening Soviet Russia. The bands of the White Guards are still at Archangel. The Caucasus is not yet liberated. For these reasons, the First Russian Army has not as yet been disbanded, but retains its inner unity and its war-like ardor in order that it may be ready in case the Socialist Fatherland should once more call it to new tasks.

(2) The First Russian Army which is, however, desirous of doing its duty does not wish to waste any time. During the coming weeks and months of rest it will have to apply its strength and its means towards the amelioration of the agricultural situation in the country.

(3) The Revolutionary War Council of the First Army will come to an agreement with the Labor Council. The representatives of the agricultural branches of the Soviet Republic will work side by side with the members of the Revolutionary Council.

(4) Food supplies are indispensable to the starving workingmen of the industrial centers. The First Labor Army should make it its prime task to gather systematically in the regions under its occupation, such food supplies as are found there, as well as to make an exact inventory of what has been obtained, and rapidly and energetically to forward them to the various railway stations for loading and transportation.

(5) Our industries require wood. It shall be the important task of the Revolutionary Labor Army to cut and to saw the wood, and to transport it to the factories and railway stations.

(6) Spring is coming. This is the season of agricultural work. As the productive labor force of our factories has fallen off, the amount of new farm machinery which can be delivered has become insufficient. The peasants have, however, a fairly large amount of old machinery which is in need of repair. The Revolutionary Labor Army will employ its mechanics and lend its workshops for the repair of such tools and machinery as are necessary. When the season arrives for labor in the fields, the Red cavalry and infantry will prove that they know how to plow the earth.

(7) All members of the Army should enter into fraternal relations with the professional unions of the local soviets, remembering that such organizations are those of the laboring people. All work should be done after having arrived at an agreement with them.

(8) Indefatigable energy should be shown in the performance of all labor, as much as if it were an engagement or a battle.

(9) The necessary labor outlays as well as the results obtained should be carefully calculated. Every pound of soviet bread, every log of national wood should be registered. Everything should contribute to the foundation of socialist economy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(10) The Commandants and Commissars should be responsible for the output of their men while work is going on, as much as if it were a fighting engagement. Discipline should not be relaxed. The Communist societies should be models of perseverance and patience.

(11) The Revolutionary Tribunals should punish the lazy, the parasites, and the thieves of national property.

(12) Conscientious soldiers, workmen, and revolutionary peasants should be in the first rank. Their bravery and devotion should serve as an example and as an inspiration to others.

(13) The front should be contracted as much as possible. Superfluous soldiers should be sent to the first ranks of the workers.

(14) Start and finish your work if local conditions permit it to the sound of revolutionary hymns and songs. Your tasks are not the work of hired laborers but a great service to be rendered to our Socialist Fatherland.

(15) Soldiers of the Third Army, you are the First Revolutionary Army of Labor! Let your example prove a great one. All Russia will rise to your call. The radio has already spread throughout the world all that the Third Army hopes to do as the First Army of Labor. Soldier Workmen, do not lower the Red standard!

(Signed) *The President of the War Council of the Revolutionary Republic.*

TROTZKY

The Red Militia

THE text of the following proclamation of Trotzky, regarding the conversion of the Soviet Army into a "labor militia," originally appeared in *Pravda* for March 16, and is here reprinted from the *Morning Post* (London).

(1) The approaching end of civil war and the favorable change in Soviet Russia's foreign political situation place the question of a thorough reform of the military organization first on the order of the day.

(2) As long as the bourgeoisie remains in power in the greater states the Socialist Republic cannot regard itself as safe. It follows that our means of defense must be carefully maintained.

(3) During the present transitional period the introduction of a red militia is the most suitable plan.

(4) The red militia must in the meantime come into intimate contact with the process of production in certain important branches of industry, at the same time maintaining its military qualities.

(5) Regiments, brigades, and divisions should be spread out over the branches of industry.

(6) The red labor and peasant militia, consisting of workmen and peasants trained in war, can be called to arms at any time and sent against the enemy.

(7) The transition to the militia system can be carried out by degrees, regard being paid to the necessity of the army preserving its fighting efficiency the whole time.

(8) On the gradual demobilization of the Red Army its best nuclei should not be split up but employed in the same industrial areas.

(9) The command of each militia formation should be composed of the best elements of the local proletariat.

(10) Local courses should be arranged for the continual perfection of the command.

(11) Military training should otherwise consist of: (a) instruction in military duties of the lads not of military age; (b) training of citizens of military age, the annual periods of training being gradually shortened and the barracks converted as far as practicable into military-political schools; (c) short supplementary courses of training.

(12) The organization of the *cadres* of the militia should in everything be based on the principle of universal labor service.

(13) As the militia has the object of preparing the gradual transformation of the Russian people into an armed communist nation, the militia in its organization should retain the character of a dictatorship of the working class.

Decisions of the French Socialists

THE French Socialist Party, at its national congress held at Strasbourg on February 25-29, adopted the following resolution favoring the calling of a new Internationale, by a vote of 2,299 to 1,621 for immediate adhesion to the Third, or Moscow, Internationale. The congress had previously voted, 4,330 to 337, to leave the Second Internationale. The resolution on domestic policy was adopted by a show of hands.

FOREIGN POLICY

The war which it sought to avoid seduced the Second Internationale, which had been founded at the Congress of Paris in 1889 on the principle of the class struggle, from the task of socialist organization and education to which it was dedicated.

The Second Internationale, like humanity itself, whose highest expression it was, has been materially and morally shattered by the war. Some of its national sections have been weakened still further by sharing power with the bourgeoisie—a clear violation of the principles upon which it was founded.

The Socialist Party [of France] declares that this Internationale, as now composed, has ceased to meet the revolutionary situation now existing in most countries. A new Internationale of action is required. Moreover, the Second Internationale now includes only a fraction of the socialist workers of the world.

The Third Internationale, formed at Moscow in March, 1919, has arisen in opposition to it, and declares for the integral program of the class struggle as formulated in the Communist Manifesto and in the Amsterdam Resolution of 1904, essential charters of any Socialist movement. Beside the majority of the Russian Socialists, the Socialists of Italy, Norway, Serbia, and Rumania, and sections of the Socialists of Sweden, Denmark, Bulgaria, Hungary, America, and England have joined the new Internationale.

Three important organizations have left the Second Internationale, the Swiss Socialist Party, the Socialist Party of the United States, and the Independent Socialist Party of Germany. The latter, at its Congress in December, 1919, decided to negotiate with the revolutionary socialist groups of Western Europe and to present itself to the Third Internationale with the bloc thus formed. If it did not succeed in forming such a bloc, it would nevertheless adhere to the Third Internationale.

The French Socialist Party, noting the decision of the German Independents who, during the war and after the armistice, have remained worthy of the revolutionary and internationalist tradition of the German proletariat, feels that it can no longer remain in an organization wherein Germany is represented only by Socialists who were accomplices of the Kaiser and of the counter-revolutionary maneuvers of Scheidemann and Noske.

Furthermore it considers that the present dispersion of the working-class forces of the world cannot continue without danger for the workers' revolution. Since the attempts made at Berne and Lucerne to revive the Second Internationale with the help of the radical elements of that organization seem henceforth destined to complete failure, it declares that a new grouping of the revolutionary socialist forces true to the traditional principles of international socialism is an urgent duty.

The capitalist governments of the Entente have made it impossible to know in detail or to render a complete judgment upon the entire work and action of the Russian revolution. But the French Socialist Party, sympathetic with all movements for working-class emancipation, considers that none of the funda-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mental declarations of the Moscow Internationale is in contradiction with the essential principles of socialism as they have been defined by the international congresses, that the thesis of the "dictatorship of the proletariat," in so far as it is destined to assure the transition from capitalist society to the socialist regime, is the basis of every revolutionary conception, and that the institution of Workers' and Peasants' Councils, as experience has shown, may be utilized by the working class in taking power.

But it considers that the socialist parties of Western and Central Europe, in their revolutionary effort for the social transformation which is coming about in all the countries of advanced industrial development, should act in full accord with the working-class organisms already existing—labor unions and cooperatives—and that adaptation of these organisms to the special economic circumstances should be one of the essential instruments of that transformation.

Consequently it declares that these socialist parties and the parties of the Third Internationale should undertake joint negotiations.

It considers that the parties which seek a new grouping should first of all condemn any collaboration of any sort with the bourgeoisie, and especially cabinet coalitions such as existed during the war and after the war in most European countries.

The French Socialist Party adheres whole-heartedly to the suggestion of the German Independents, and affirms its will to work for the reconstitution of the world unity of socialism, by fusion between all the elements of the Second Internationale which have remained faithful to the principles of the class struggle, and the groups forming the Third Internationale.

It proclaims its desire both to manifest active sympathy for the Russian revolution, and to remain close to the efforts of the working classes of the great industrial countries, especially England and America, in their special historic and economic conditions.

In order to end the unfortunate situation caused by the temporary dispersion of the Internationale, this Congress, resolved upon immediate action, instructs the Executive Committee of the party, while maintaining contact with the national sections of the western parties, to enter into negotiations immediately with the proper organs of the Third Internationale and, in accord with the German Independents, the Swiss, and the Italian parties, to prepare a conference with a view to grouping with the parties forming the Third Internationale all parties resolved to maintain their action upon the basis of the traditional principles of socialism.

DOMESTIC POLICY

The Socialist Party declares that now more than ever before its national action should be a function of the international action of world socialism. It reasserts its determination to strive, in its own country, for the organization of the workers into a class party for the conquest of power with the intention of proceeding, with the force of the enfranchised working class, to the socialization of all the instruments of production and exchange, the common purpose of sincere socialists the world around. . . .

In this spirit the party calls attention to the menace to the nation caused by the policy pursued by the last Ministry [Clemenceau] and continued by the present [Millerand]. It denounces the absurd legend against which history will protest, that an incoherent individual incapable of creative action was responsible for a victory which was in fact due solely to the multiplied sacrifice of French soldiers and to the irresistible force of foreign revolutions, all born of the Russian revolution.

It notes the deplorable results of this policy which it has so many times denounced, and which, more than a year after the armistice, is still incapable of establishing definite peace. It notes, too, the failure of the League of Nations, and of the fraudulent application of the principle of nationality. It again denounces the crimes inflicted by the capitalist states of the Entente upon the peoples, and the more or less disguised hostilities against the Socialist Republic of Russia, whose magnificent victories it salutes.

The Socialist Party, political expression of the workers of France, is in duty bound to consider the economic and financial situation which is daily growing worse. It foresaw all the present difficulties, just as it forewarned that a reactionary parliamentary majority would impose unjust burdens upon the mass of the workers, would increase indirect taxes, and would refuse to strike at acquired wealth and war profiteers. . . .

More than ever it demands:

Direct taxes attacking swollen revenues and capital, based upon the conscription of wealth, going as far as total restitution by war profiteers, thieves of the nation;

Socialization of capitalist monopolies;

Organization of transportation by the state under the direction of responsible experts;

Administration by municipalities of real estate and new building, bringing the necessary energy to the solution of the housing crisis.

The Congress instructs its representatives in the Chamber of Deputies and in the municipal councils to support socialist solutions vigorously and uncompromisingly, and to appeal by incessant propaganda to the people who should understand that the general situation of the country is becoming more and more revolutionary.

The party denounces to the workers, who by their sacrifice assured the national defense, the attitude of the bourgeoisie, more and more avid, brutal, and selfish in its determination to maintain the de facto dictatorship which assures its control.

The 1,600,000 dead, whose sacrifice was to have ushered in a new era of justice among the peoples and of fraternity among the citizens of France, fell in vain. There is no victory except for capitalism, piling up its profits.

The Socialist Party appeals to the workers to organize in every field in order to develop their power and to hasten, by all methods, the coming of the revolution.

The Secret Congress at Amsterdam

THE report of the Executive Committee of the British Socialist Party, presented to the annual conference of the party on April 4, contained the following interesting statement, printed in the London *Times*, regarding the secret congress of western groups affiliated with the Third Internationale held at Amsterdam in February.

During the year we have maintained as close relations as possible with the Communist parties and groups in other countries. The British Socialist Party was represented by two delegates at a conference of the Third International held at Amsterdam. D. Wynkoop (Netherlands Communist Party) was selected chairman. Delegates were present from Great Britain (British Socialist Party, Workers' Socialist Federation, and Workers' Committees); Germany (one delegate representing an anti-Parliamentarian group); Holland; America (Communist Party); and Belgium. Hungary was represented unofficially by a comrade who had been a member of the Budapest Government during the Bela Kun regime, and Russia by a Dutch comrade holding a direct mandate from Moscow. Later a comrade attended unofficially from Switzerland. A letter was read from Comrade F. Loriot stating his inability to come from France, and sending greetings to the conference.

Wynkoop, in opening the proceedings, referred to an attempt made some time ago to hold a conference in Germany. It had failed, the only persons attending being "some Germans, two Rumanians, and Sylvia Pankhurst."

Comrade R. [Rutgers] who, as stated above, had a direct mandate from Moscow, and had only recently arrived from there,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made a statement. He had been deputed by the Executive of the Third Internationale to establish a bureau for Western Europe for the purpose of keeping in communication with the affiliated bodies in all countries. It was considered that Holland, owing to its geographical situation, was the best country in which to establish such a bureau. Wireless messages could be received there from Moscow. It was also proposed to establish a press bureau for the purpose of keeping all countries supplied with news of interest. The initial organization for such a purpose was already in existence. The financial needs of the organization would be supplied in the first instance by a small grant to the bureau from each country affiliated (the British delegates agreed that this should amount to a minimum of £5 per organization represented from Great Britain).

On his arrival in Germany he found that a West European bureau was already functioning there, but without mandate. He suggested that it should be transformed into a Central European bureau, representing the interests of Austria, Hungary, and the Balkan States, and linking up with West Europe through the bureau now being established. Arrangements were also made to link up with Japan and China through America.

It was agreed that meetings of the bureau would be held every three months if possible. England, France, and Germany would form a quorum, but if any one of them was not represented two of the smaller countries would be held equivalent.

The first subject discussed was the practical measures to be taken to stop intervention in Russia. Miss Pankhurst moved a resolution the practical effect of which was that a movement for an international general strike in support of Russia should be initiated forthwith by the Communist parties in each country. The general sense of the conference was against this, and eventually a composite resolution was adopted to the effect that every occasion of industrial unrest should be taken advantage of to press home the seriousness of the capitalist attack on Russia, and that organization should be definitely directed toward the end of a general strike.

The conference was conducted under circumstances of great difficulty, owing to the action of the Dutch authorities, and eventually closed without finishing its agenda.

The resolution of the Amsterdam conference regarding Soviet Russia, various versions of which have been made public, was printed in the *Workers' Dreadnought* (London) "as it was actually adopted in Amsterdam." The text of it follows:

A revolutionary action of the workers, to force international capital to make peace with Russia, is a necessary condition to save Soviet Russia, and to hasten the world revolution.

To further this action, the communists of all lands must utilize every strike movement, every mass demonstration

(1) To place this aspect of their responsibilities to the Russian revolution before the workers;

(2) To convince them that their interests are identical with those of Soviet Russia;

(3) To develop a strong feeling of revolutionary solidarity and revolutionary action the world over.

As the pressure of the workers upon the governments is increasing, the tendency is for the capitalist governments to propose a compromise peace, with the object of disintegrating Soviet Russia from within. The latest proposal to take up commercial relations through reactionary representatives of prerevolutionary cooperative societies that have since merged into the Soviet organizations, aims at separating the peasants from the workers and destroying the Soviet monopoly of foreign trade. Under the cloak of such maneuvers, a great military spring offensive is being prepared, which must be prevented at all costs.

It is, therefore, essential that this international bureau takes immediate steps to prepare an international demonstration-strike against intervention in Soviet Russia. Such a strike not alone to demand ending the blockade and intervention in Soviet Russia, but to include political and economic demands adapted to the revolutionary requirements of the conditions prevailing in each nation. This demonstration to be supplemented by coercive strikes as the workers gain strength for such further action, in which special attention has to be paid to the expedition and transportation of war materials and equipment, propaganda being carried on to withhold labor in such instances.

The appeal to the workers for international strike-action must not be made exclusively through the bureaucracy of the trade unions, but emphasis must be placed upon the masses in the unions, upon extra-union mass organs, and the creation of such organs if necessary.

When the revolution again rises in Germany, or in any other country, the forces of the international proletariat (especially the transport workers in Britain, America, France, Italy, Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland) must be prepared for a general strike the moment the capitalist Powers attempt intervention. The bureau is to take immediate steps for organizing this action in time to prevent the workers being again forestalled by the governments.

British Labor and the Cooperatives

AS the result of the entry into the political field of the British Cooperatives, a tentative agreement has been reached between the Cooperative Party and a committee representing the Labor Party and the Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee to form an alliance for political purposes. The draft constitution of the proposed Labor and Cooperative Political Alliance follows:

Name

The Labor and Cooperative Political Alliance.

Membership

The Labor and Cooperative Political Alliance shall consist of the affiliated organizations of the Labor Party, Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee, and the Cooperative Party.

Objects

To correlate and coordinate the forces and activities of the labor and cooperative movements in respect to representation in Parliament and on all local administrative bodies, and to sustain and support one another in their respective and combined efforts to set up a new social order and with the ultimate object of the establishment of a cooperative commonwealth.

Joint Committee

There shall be a joint committee of the alliance consisting of nine members, three to be elected by each of the bodies represented in the alliance.

Procedure

With a view to securing concerted action on political matters and to avoid a clashing of interests represented in the three affiliated organizations the Joint Committee shall be empowered:

(a) To make declarations of policy on political matters in harmony with the decisions of the conferences of the three bodies;

(b) To arrange conferences to consider candidatures in parliamentary contests with a view to avoiding a clashing of interests;

(c) To indorse on behalf of the Joint Committee officially nominated parliamentary candidates of the Labor Party or the Cooperative Party;

(d) In all elections, steps to be taken to secure concerted action in favor of the candidates nominated, in accordance with clause (c);

(e) To recommend to local Labor parties and Cooperative parties that a similar procedure be adopted in connection with candidates nominated for local administrative bodies;

(f) And to take such other steps as may be deemed necessary to achieve the objects of the Labor and Cooperative Alliance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED